

WEST VIRGINIA

William O. Starcher, Cowen.
John S. Knight, Glen Ferris.
Curtis Crotty, Mullens.

WISCONSIN

Lloyd R. Helgeson, Baldwin.
Russell C. Toepke, Fremont.

WYOMING

Patrick J. O'Dea, Laramie.
Clyde D. Elledge, Powell.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Henry W. Snyder, D. D., pastor, St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Let us pray:

Heavenly Father, it is a wonderful privilege to have a place in these halls; but a tremendous responsibility too; a sacred stewardship; a God-given trust. The wisest of men, when facing the heavy tasks of his new kingdom, humbly stood before Thee and confessed that he was but a little child, not knowing how to go out or to come in. So he prayed for an understanding heart.

Today we make that same request; grant unto these Thy servants, yea, unto all of us, an understanding heart. Grant it to us vertically that we may rightly know our relationship to Thee, for we acknowledge our first duty to love Thee with our whole being. Then grant it to us horizontally, that we may know our right relationship to our fellow men, for our second duty is to love them as ourselves. So may there radiate from these halls, and from every life, influences and activities that shall be a blessing to our own land and Nation, and to the nations of the world. So may we glorify Thy holy cause and kingdom. We ask this in the name of the Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 17, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 17, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 44. An act for the relief of Arthur O. Fisher;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife; and

S. 2559. An act to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow to attend the ceremonies in connection with the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battles of Lexington and Concord.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

At his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAYBANK was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 3 days.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS
COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, the first report of the progress of the Commission, covering the period from September 19, 1949, to April 12, 1950, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REDUCTION OF FLOW OF PETROLEUM
IMPORTATIONS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Mississippi Legislature has adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to reduce the flow of imported petroleum into the United States to an amount which will bring to an end the injury being suffered by the petroleum-producing industry of Mississippi and the United States generally and thereby promote the security and welfare of the Nation.

I am sure this problem is of vital interest to the entire country and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution, and that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rules, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 35

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to reduce the flow of imported petroleum into the United States to an amount which will bring to an end the injury being suffered by the petroleum-producing industry of Mississippi and the United States and thereby promote the security and welfare of this Nation

Whereas there has been a large increase in the importation of crude petroleum and products into the United States, against which no effective restriction exists in the laws of this country; and

Whereas the production of petroleum in the State of Mississippi has been decreased

to an injurious extent as the result of foreign petroleum usurpation of the markets normally supplied from the resources of Mississippi, such decrease in the year 1949 being more than 16 percent from the level of the previous year; and

Whereas the petroleum-producing industry has increasingly for years added greatly to the industrial and business development of Mississippi and gives great promise through discovery and development of becoming a large factor in the economy of the South and Southeast States of the Union; and

Whereas the development and production of crude petroleum and the refining thereof is an industry whose benefits are widespread, affording employment, distribution of royalty, rental and bonus moneys to landowners, increases in State and local revenues for the maintenance of government and the support of schools and other public institutions; and

Whereas the enforced curtailment of the production of crude petroleum in Mississippi and the substantial decline in drilling activities for the development of existing oil fields and the exploration for new ones has seriously impaired the State's revenues and has markedly injured the economy of the State; and

Whereas the State of Mississippi has through its enacted laws established a program of conservation to prevent the waste of oil and gas and has thus provided for the use of sound engineering methods in the production of these resources, which program is disturbed and threatened with demoralization by the loss of markets for oil produced under efficient and orderly conditions; and

Whereas the geological conditions in Mississippi are such as to encourage the belief that many millions of barrels of petroleum will be discovered provided there is reasonable assurance that the discoverers and developers will be able to recover their investments through the sale of the petroleum they may produce, thus raising the general economic standards of Mississippi and the geographical region closely related to Mississippi; and

Whereas the full development of oil and gas resources are in the national interest, providing a dependable supply for defense and stimulating the business and commercial life of the Nation: Be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, That the Congress be and hereby is importuned to give immediate attention to proposals now before it and to others which may be introduced for the limitation of imported oil to such amount as will cause no further injury to the oil producing industry of the State of Mississippi and to the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Senators and Representatives in Congress elected by the people of Mississippi, to the members of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 9, 1950.

WALTER SILLERS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate March 29, 1950.

SAM LUMPKIN,

President of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by delegates at the eighth annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Chicago, Ill., on March 9,

1950, relating to REA loans, administrative funds, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

Be it resolved, That National Rural Electric Cooperative Association does express appreciation to the President of the United States and to those Members of Congress who have, through sound and forward-looking legislation, in the form of loans, made possible the construction of electric-power lines to give service to over 3,000,000 rural homes, and thereby renewed the faith, stimulated the hope and increased the force of rural America.

REA LOAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS

Be it resolved, That the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association urge the Congress to authorize \$400,000,000 for loan funds for the rural-electrification program for the fiscal year 1951, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That said association urge the Congress to approve \$7,425,000 for administrative purposes for the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1951 as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

FARM-ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH

Be it resolved, That this association urge the Congress to make available to the Farm Electrification Division of the Agricultural Research Administration the amount of \$500,000 for farm-electrification research.

ACQUISITION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Be it resolved, That this association urge the Congress to amend the Rural Electrification Administration Act to provide for loans for acquisitions, provided the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration shall find the following circumstances to exist:

1. That the security of existing loans made by the Administrator shall not be impaired.
2. That the borrower will be benefited, either financially or by improved operating conditions.
3. That the service to the acquired systems will not be impaired.
4. That the existing facilities are so located as to permit effective integration of the system to be acquired.
5. That the sale is voluntary on the part of the seller.

CHANGE IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Be it resolved, That in order to permit the extension of the rural electrification program to the more thinly populated areas of the country and in order to permit our systems to generate and transmit more power where same is found to be advisable, we urge the Congress to authorize the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, in his discretion, to extend the amortization period of REA loans from 35 years to 50 years.

TELEPHONE LOAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS

Be it resolved, That NRECA urge the Congress to authorize \$50,000,000 for the rural telephone program for the fiscal year of 1951, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to appropriate \$2,100,000 for the administration of the rural telephone program by the Rural Electrification Administration, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

LOAN POLICY LIBERALIZATIONS

Whereas there are pending in the Congress certain legislative proposals, among which are H. R. 6782 and S. 2882, which seek to restrict and limit the power and authority of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for generation and transmission purposes; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this association that legislation of that type will adversely affect the expansion of the rural electrification program of the electric cooperatives, as well as jeopardize the existing system and those now under construction, and increase the critical power shortages in all areas of the Nation; and

Whereas the electric cooperatives in various parts of the Nation, being unable to obtain a dependable and adequate source of low-cost power, have found it necessary to obtain loans from REA for these purposes; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that generation and transmission cooperatives can supply a dependable source of power to be delivered at the load centers of the member cooperatives with improved service to farm members and that generation and transmission cooperatives have secured a reduction in power costs enabling the extension of rural electric service to more thinly settled areas and thus provided complete area coverage and have eliminated restrictive and prohibitive power-use clauses contained in power contracts of many utilities, thus providing unrestricted power use for members of rural power cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association hereby voices its determined opposition to any limitation or restriction by legislation, such as H. R. 6782 or S. 2882, or otherwise, upon the power and authority of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans beneficial to eligible borrowers in the development of the rural electrification program; be it further

Resolved, That Congress is urged to appropriate additional funds for financing of cooperatives, generating plants, and transmission facilities; and that Congress be urged—

- (1) to empower the Administrator of REA to liberalize the policy of making loans to REA borrowers for generation and transmission purposes;
- (2) to authorize him to make such loans whenever in his judgment they are justified under good business principles; and
- (3) that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Congress.

CO-OP GENERATION RIGHTS

Be it resolved, That we vigorously reaffirm our right to generate and transmit our own electricity and our right to integrate our generation facilities with Federal hydro projects when necessary and feasible in order to obtain the great economies that result therefrom.

In each area where cooperatives have a generation plant the power companies have failed or refused to meet cooperative requirements for an adequate supply of wholesale power at reasonable rates without restrictions, otherwise the plant would not have been financed by REA in the first place. We call the attention of the Congress to the fact that, as of last year, cooperatives were generating only 6 percent of the power used, and that issue raised by the power companies is unwarranted in fact, and that many of the statements which have been made to congressional committees and to the general public through the press are unfounded and designed to mislead.

CO-OP TAXATION

Whereas certain people, led by large corporate interests, including combinations of power companies, have been spreading vicious propaganda against rural power cooperatives, charging the cooperatives with tax dodging and with the socialization of electric industry; and

Whereas the specific proposal of such interests is that patronage refunds or capital credits of cooperatives be subjected to Federal income taxes; and

Whereas said patronage refunds or capital credits of the rural power cooperatives are not profits or income to the cooperative, but

are in fact contributions to the capital of the cooperatives; and

Whereas cooperatives are upon the same basis taxwise as partnerships or individually owned businesses, and their members pay income taxes on said refunds or credits on the same basis as those paid by the individuals, or partners in a partnership; and

Whereas the loans to the rural power cooperatives by the Rural Electrification Administration were made, and the obligations assumed by the cooperatives, upon the basis of their nonprofit character, and that it would be unjust for the Congress to alter or change the tax status of the cooperatives, and impair the ability of the cooperatives to repay said loans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association urge the Congress to preserve the present income-tax status of the rural power cooperatives, and the exemption of patronage refunds or capital credits from Federal income tax.

CONDEMNATION OF POWER COMPANY ATTACKS

Whereas representatives of 38 of our generation and transmission cooperatives met in emergency session March 8, 1950, to discuss attempts of commercial power companies to prejudice the members of the joint Agriculture Subcommittee and Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress; and

Whereas the attacks of commercial power companies would destroy the rights of the rural electric cooperatives to generate and transmit electric power and to integrate their facilities with hydro development or commercial power company facilities; and

Whereas representatives of commercial power companies have deliberately attempted, through letters and personal contacts, to misrepresent to Members of Congress the benefits that have already accrued and will continue to accrue through generation and transmission loans; and

Whereas the generation and transmission loans that are being criticized by the commercial power companies were applied for by the farmers and are absolutely essential to the life and continued growth of rural electrification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the more than 4,000 representatives of the rural electric cooperatives and power districts throughout the United States here assembled—and which are now serving more than 3,000,000 farm families—severely condemn the misrepresentations of commercial power companies that are trying to perpetuate their power supply monopoly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Congress, and that we urge the Members of Congress to support the present generation program, and to be on guard against the malicious and vicious attacks of the power companies on this phase of the rural electrification program—which has the overwhelming support of our 3,000,000 farm families—and further urge their active support of the necessary REA loan funds without restrictions.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL POWER RESOURCES

Whereas the United States, in its numerous great rivers and river basins, is possessed of the assets and resources that will, upon maximum development, retain, enrich our soil, provide navigation in many instances, and retard disastrous floods, provide unlimited recreation for the people of the country and insure adequate electrical power supply to meet the long-range demand of all individuals and industries alike, resulting in such a combination of facilities for progress that America can achieve its highest potential standard of progress and prosperity; and

Whereas it is to the personal interest of all the more than 12,000,000 farm people now served by rural power cooperatives that the development of all of these phases of the river and river basin resources be expedited

with emphasis on the pressing need of the power cooperatives for additional dependable, low-cost power sources, without which the rural power cooperatives cannot attain their maximum service; and

Whereas it is recognized that much work has been done, and progress made, in planning the development of this resource by the Department of the Interior, Corps of Engineers, and other assisting agencies in this Government, and progress has been made toward the consummation of some of this planning, which clearly shows the wisdom of the undertaking by the achievements already attained; and

Whereas the projects under plan and which should be planned are so numerous that no attempt should be made to enumerate them here, yet each and all are of the greatest importance to the area of their location and taken in the aggregate of the highest national interest: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the development of all of the country's potential hydroelectric power as rapidly as practicable; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to provide funds and loan authorizations for river basin and water power developments, and for the generation of electricity in connection therewith; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to provide funds and loan authorization for the construction of transmission lines to distribute the electric power so generated to cooperatives and municipal consumers, at their load centers, and to integrate various generation projects; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to provide funds and loan authorizations for the construction of steam and Diesel generating capacity where necessary to firm up hydrogeneration and to improve the efficiency of such generation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to continue the established power policy of the United States, thus providing for development of potential hydropower and the sale and delivery to load centers of the consumer of this power wholesale, over self-liquidating transmission lines—first, to public bodies and cooperatives, and then to private companies in that order—and to the accomplishment of this end, it should provide adequate appropriations for construction and administration.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX— RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN PARK AND RECREATION SOCIETY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Park and Recreation Society, and ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a statement of 1 minute on the subject of repeal of certain nuisance taxes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented previously on the urgent necessity of repealing the current nuisance tax on admissions affecting recreation facilities and activities conducted by Uncle Sam, by the State governments, and by municipal or county governments. I feel that it is ridiculous that there should be continued the present high wartime rate of admissions taxes on units of governments which are trying to meet the needs of the people within

their respective jurisdictions. I have stated also that it is absurd to continue, for example, to tax county agricultural fairs and similar public service enterprises.

I am indeed sorry that the Democratic majority of the House Ways and Means Committee has refused to allow this issue of excise-tax repeal to come up immediately, but has instead insisted that excise-tax repeal wait for the preparation of an over-all tax-revision plan, a matter which is expected to take many more months. The people of the United States are sick and tired of these nuisance taxes, and the taxes on city recreation facilities are a particular pain in the neck.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a message just received from the Wisconsin Park and Recreation Society whose secretary is a Mr. Warner Bartram. This society met last month and adopted a resolution for repeal of admissions taxes. The society is a section of a league of Wisconsin municipalities, and has as members those interested in recreation from all over Wisconsin as well as Minnesota and Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of the resolution sent to me by the society as prepared by its president and resolutions committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas bills H. R. 271 and H. R. 7258 have been introduced in the Congress of the United States and said bills propose to exempt from admissions tax admissions to recreation facilities and activities operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments or the political subdivisions thereof; and

Whereas admissions taxes as such were imposed mainly as a wartime necessity and were never intended to be levied beyond the actual war years; and

Whereas taxes imposed on admissions to recreational facilities and activities administered or operated by schools, park and recreation agencies and departments tend to decrease and discourage participation in wholesome and healthful recreational pursuits which mainly serve children, youth, and adults who depend upon and require such activities for their well-being; and

Whereas Federal regulations require a system of collecting, recording, and reporting taxes derived from fees in operations for public recreation, fees, which for the most part, are very nominal and seldom cover the cost of operation. Taxes on this type of admission can well be classified as nuisance taxes: Be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin Park and Recreation Society, assembled in annual meeting at Madison, Wis., That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby requested to enact H. R. 271 and H. R. 7258 and thereby remove the burden of taxes presently imposed on activities and on facilities operated by the Federal Government, its State governments, the political subdivisions thereof;

Resolved further, That copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman representing the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Ways and Means Com-

mittee, which committee is now considering the bills herein referred to.

Adopted by the Wisconsin Park and Recreation Society at Madison, Wis., this 3d day of March 1950.

GEORGE SIMMONS,
President.
WARNER E. BARTRAM,
Secretary.

JEROME C. DRETZKA,
Dr. T. O. GOERES,
GEORGE SPEIDEL,
Resolutions Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2510. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Anson Harold Pease, a Crow allottee, a patent in fee to certain lands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1501).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2551. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Julia Two Crow a patent in fee to certain land; with amendments (Rept. No. 1505);

S. 2552. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Betty Little White Man a patent in fee to certain land; with amendments (Rept. No. 1506); and

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution requesting burial in Arlington National Cemetery of the last surviving member of the Grand Army of the Republic upon his death; with amendments (Rept. No. 1508).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5556. A bill to make available for Indian use certain surplus property at the Wingate Ordnance Depot, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2980. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cigar-wrapper type 61 tobacco and cigar-wrapper type 62 tobacco; with amendments (Rept. No. 1502).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 87. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503); and

H. R. 6552. A bill to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1504).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 18, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2911) to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3439. A bill for the relief of Jan Urdal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 3440. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3441. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land of Charles and Clyde Greyhair and Alice Greyhair Armell under jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian Agency, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS (for Mr. LONG):

S. 3442. A bill for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3443. A bill for the relief of Wallace Hsing-hwa Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELL:

S. 3444. A bill for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 3445. A bill for the relief of Roton Point Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the annual banquet of the Amen Corner Club, at the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pa., April 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW TO REGAIN LOST WATER RIGHTS—ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Regain Lost Water Rights," published in the Los Angeles Times of April 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Views of Dr. Lattimore," published in the New York Times of April 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES—ADDRESS BY JOHN A. HANNAH

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by President John A. Hannah, of Michigan State College, at the sixty-third annual convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, at Kansas City, Mo., October 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY LOOKS AHEAD—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPP-MANN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Atlantic Community Looks Ahead," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of April 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BASING-POINT BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Basing-Point Bill Must Be Killed," from the April issue of the National Independent, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM RULE OF REASON

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farm Rule of Reason," writ-

ten by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer-Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOVIET POLICIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE SANTA FE NEW MEXICAN

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bigger Than the H-Bomb," published in the Santa Fe New Mexican of March 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John C. McQueen for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general of the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I should make an announcement for the benefit of all Senators. A great number of the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have been talking to me about a call of the calendar. At the present time there are on the calendar more than 250 measures which have not been considered since the last time the calendar was called. Therefore, tomorrow I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of all measures on the calendar, and the ECA bill will follow the call of the calendar, on Thursday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when the Senator says "all measures," does he mean those which have been placed on the calendar since the 1st of February?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, from February 1 on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator means measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, those to which there is no objection.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, are we to begin at the beginning of the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. No; we will begin with measures which have been placed on the calendar beginning with the 1st of February. We have not had a call of the calendar since that time. The measures now on the calendar which were placed there before February 1 will not be called tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have no intention of detaining the Senate for more than a few minutes this afternoon. Because we have before us as the unfinished business consideration of expansion of the European Recovery Act, I believe it to be appropriate that I

speak on the subject of a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. President, over the week end the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, publicly announced that he was considering a new arrangement of his subcommittees for the purpose of achieving closer cooperation between the State Department and the Congress on matters of foreign policy.

Moved by a similar spirit, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senate majority leader, made the observation in a recent address that perhaps some way could be found by which Republicans could be given better opportunities to participate in foreign policy matters in the interests of a genuine bipartisan policy.

I am greatly pleased to see these attempts being made toward closer party cooperation on matters high in the national interest. They come at a time when there has been much public debate about the conduct of our foreign affairs. I am sure our people will deeply appreciate the encouragement these Senators give to the hope that we may place the conduct of our foreign policy on a high plane. The idea of bringing unity into our councils, that America may speak to the world with a single voice, is an inspiring ideal. It is an ideal worthy of leaving no stone unturned in an effort to turn the ideal into reality.

I, too, have always held the hope that by proper arrangements between the parties our country could speak with a single voice in foreign affairs. Together, our two great political parties represent the overwhelming majority of our people. If by some arrangement the leaders of our parties can reach a common understanding on foreign problems and how to deal with them, American leadership in world affairs will be greatly strengthened.

In the past we have tried to realize this ideal. We have tried to bring the parties into closer cooperation, and we have had some remarkable successes with what came to be known as the bipartisan foreign policy. But we have also had some disappointments, which were so severe as to raise the question whether a genuine bipartisan policy can be formed and operated.

I think it is fair to say that anyone who follows the course of current opinion will admit that today there is considerable confusion over this idea of bipartisan foreign policy. Much of the critical debate in Congress stems from this confusion. The meaning of bipartisan policy has never been wholly clear in the past.

An ideal may be ever so noble and praiseworthy, but if the object is not clearly understood, and if the methods of achieving it are not commonly agreed upon, the ideal has little chance of becoming a reality. That is the most elementary principle of human relations in a democratic society.

I thought I knew what bipartisan foreign policy was. At times I felt that I could see it in operation, and I made every effort to give it my cooperation.

But I confess there were other occasions when I was not so sure. Experience with these occasions left me with the impression that either we had no bipartisan foreign policy, or, if we had had one, it was lost from sight. Others, both in official circles and elsewhere in public life, must have gained a similar impression, because there was much confusion and debate on the subject. In fact, that is the position in which we now find ourselves, because there is widespread question today about bipartisan policy in every forum. The very effort in high quarters to do something about it is recognition of the confusion and of a desire to correct difficulties that have arisen.

It seems to me that if we are to give renewed vigor to a policy we believe to be desirable, we ought to cut clear through to the roots of the problem. We ought to clarify beyond a shadow of doubt what we mean by bipartisan foreign policy, and exactly how we propose to work it. I am completely out of patience with all the speculation about what the policy is. Why is it that it covers one subject but not another? Why is it that the policy is invoked at one time and not at other times? Is it fair to ask any Senator to cooperate on a bipartisan foreign policy when it is not made crystal clear what that policy is, or what the ground rules are by which we are to carry on our cooperation? We ought to know from the highest sources what is expected of us.

I have no desire to embarrass anybody in this matter, but I think this confusion and constant bickering show a growing demand that the air be cleared.

With that in view I have formulated a series of questions which seem to me to go to the root of our difficulties. If bipartisan policy is in trouble, it is because we do not have the answers to these questions. If the policy is desirable, and if it is to succeed, I believe we must have the answers to questions like these rather than the vague generalities which have created so much misunderstanding.

The questions which I believe the whole country would like to have answered are these:

First. What is the State Department's conception of a bipartisan or unpartisan foreign policy?

Second. What does the State Department expect of our major political parties?

Third. Is bipartisan foreign policy supposed to restrain the political parties from making political capital out of American foreign relations?

Fourth. How is the policy expected to work, with reference particularly to the President's prerogatives in foreign affairs, the constitutional provisions bearing on the subject, notably the role of the Senate and the Congress at large in implementing foreign policy, and the realities of our two-party political system with its responsiveness to the public?

Fifth. Through what arrangements, devices, and techniques between the parties is the policy to be operated?

Sixth. Are the party leaderships in Congress to participate actively in the formulation of foreign policy as well as

in its expression in the form of legislative acts?

Seventh. Since the State Department and the President execute policy, and since administration of policy may lead to controversy, does the conception of bipartisan policy admit of criticism in this area?

Eighth. If it does admit of criticism, how is such criticism expected to operate? Is it expected to operate in bipartisan councils, on the floors of Congress, or by framing and taking issues to the people?

Ninth. If fundamental differences develop in framing the objectives of foreign policy and especially in selecting and placing in operation the methods of executing policy, how are these differences to be resolved in the conception of a bipartisan foreign policy?

Tenth. Domestic issues often are so closely related to matters of foreign policy as to be the other side of the same coin, as, for example, in the relationship of foreign expenditures and budgetary economy, in the question of tariffs, and so forth. The parties sometimes differ sharply on these matters. Does the bipartisan foreign policy leave room for creating issues on these domestic matters when foreign policies must indirectly be drawn into public debate upon them?

Eleventh. I believe it is fair to say that heretofore the President and the State Department have, in effect, chosen the subjects they have considered appropriate for bipartisan foreign policy, including, as examples, the United Nations and the inter-American treaties, and excluding, as examples, other subjects or phases, such as Yalta, Potsdam, and the China policy. Does the bipartisan policy contemplate a continuance of this practice, and what criteria is applied? Can bipartisan policy be deemed consistent or capable of clarity and definition if the practice is to be followed?

Twelfth. How should the personnel from both parties who are to serve in bipartisan arrangements be selected?

These questions are designed to clarify what is meant by bipartisan foreign policy. They are drawn up to bring out what the ground rules are to be for the conduct of bipartisan cooperation.

Experience has shown that in the absence of these ground rules we have not achieved the ends of foreign policy which bipartisan action is designed to secure.

The question remains as to how we may go about this much-needed clarification. After considered thought on the problem I respectfully suggest that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ask his committee to devote 1 or 2 days to exploring the fundamental basis of a bipartisan policy as suggested by the questions I have presented. I am sure he would receive wholehearted cooperation on every hand. In the spirit of sincere inquiry I am sure he could draw upon many sources for authoritative opinions. Among these might be the Secretary of State, representatives from the party policy committees in Senate and House, prominent persons in public life who are well informed on international affairs, and any others the committee may wish to hear.

With the information gathered from sources which are counted upon to make bipartisan policy work in spirit and substance, the meaning of the policy could be clarified. What is equally important, the committee could suggest the ground rules which both parties may reasonably be asked to respect in order to achieve harmony and cooperation in American foreign policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I heard all but one of the questions which the Senator suggested. All his questions concern substance. As I heard them, they do not go in any way into the matter of personalities. Are there not two very fundamental foundations on which to base a bipartisan or an unpartisan foreign policy? Is not one permission to a member of the minority party to partake of the conception of the policy? Is not another that, even though such person is well selected from the Congress or elsewhere, he must have such a personality and such prestige as to lend weight to the ideas he offers of what a given foreign policy means, and to his part in making it up? Is that not fundamental?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true. One of the questions I suggested I believe would cover that point. That is the one as to how the persons are to be chosen, who they would be, how they would be expected to cooperate. If they are not from among the membership of Congress, they must be such as to understand the position of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on this important subject, so that when they are looking over the policy in advance, prior to the making of the policy, they may sense what is intended by the Senate and by the House. I think the problem goes much further than that, however. Not only is personality involved, but the substance, as to how the policy is to be made to work is involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. My question went to the point that, in order to make it work the Republican, or member of the minority party for the time being, who participates in the making of the policy, must have prestige and knowledge and personality.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt about that. If a policy is to be made in connection with which we are not in on the take-off but only on the crash landing, we are not going to have a successful bipartisan arrangement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have thought about this matter a good deal lately. Does not the success of a bipartisan or an unpartisan policy depend largely on personalities rather than on anything else?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not say so. I think we have to consider the personalities of the 96 Senators and the personalities of the 435 Representatives and, let us say, the personality of the executive, plus even the personality of the American citizenry, in making up the foreign policy. But I think there must be more than personality. In my opinion, there must be ground rules by which can be determined what shall be bipartisan

foreign policy, and what shall not be bipartisan foreign policy. If the executive is to be the one who chooses we confront a road block and cannot have an over-all foreign policy. I am asking these questions sincerely, because I believe they should be discussed. I believe we should arrive at some ground rules, as I have expressed it, in order that a bipartisan foreign policy may be a success.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. My only purpose in rising and asking any questions was to indicate my view that emphasis should be placed as much on personalities as on ground rules.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, if what the Senator calls "personalities" are capable and responsible persons, then the Senator and I agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have in mind the Senator's colleague from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator has in measure answered the Senator from Massachusetts. But I think any suggestion that we can recreate in this body a VANDENBERG is not a thing to which we should address ourselves. For better or worse, through the period of the war, the senior Senator from Michigan occupied a unique position which, in my judgment, is not likely to be reconstituted. There is nothing more fundamental—and I gather the Senator from Michigan agrees—than that the 96 responsible Members of this body, with their responsibilities in foreign relations, should be measurably represented. Not that the President can discuss the subject, or that the Secretary of State can do so, with all 96 Senators, but that he can discuss the subject with the responsible leadership on each side of the aisle, and in foreign policy unpartisanism involves as much the other side as it does ours.

In view of certain developments of recent days it is clear there are fully as marked divisions on the other side as on this side. Is it not true that two of the episodes which might be calculated to create most doubt regarding our united position on foreign policy are speeches recently delivered by two of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, one of whom, a member of the committee from the other side of the aisle, suggested a \$50,000,000,000 advance to appease Russia, and the other of whom suggested a disarmament conference? I speak of this in no criticism, but only as calculated to throw doubt upon whether or not even on the other side of the aisle there is unity.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. There has been much evidence of a lack of a cohesive pattern on the other side as to our foreign relations. That is why I ask how we are going to attain the objective we have in mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Michigan not want—and I trust the Senator from Massachusetts will agree—to substitute for the single personality implicit in his questions, that the responsible leadership of both the minority and the majority should be

consulted; that it cannot be the matter of an individual, however wise or far-seeing?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Maine that, of course, I did not mean to limit the participation necessarily to one person. There might be three persons or five persons. Perhaps there could not be a greater number than that, but in the persons selected all groups of the minority party must have confidence. They may not agree with them, they may differ with them, but they must have confidence in their judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he feels there can be any harmonious foreign policy, whether it is called bipartisan or whatever it may be called, unless those who represent the two parties are called into the consultation? Does the Senator from Michigan wish to answer that question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I asked that question among the interrogatories suggested in my remarks. My judgment is that they must be called in consultation. If a bipartisan foreign policy is to be established, they must know the facts. They must be consulted as to what the policy shall be.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that completely. But the Senator has not given a complete answer to my question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, I do not understand the question.

Mr. WHERRY. My question is this: Can someone outside the group of those who actually are here in the Senate debating the issues on the floor of the Senate, represent that group, unless such person works through the leadership of the party?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the persons from the outside will cooperate with the leadership of the Senate and House, in the case of both parties, then I think we can get a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the outside participant must have access to all the conferences of the policy committees, where the policies are determined. Is not that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true.

Mr. WHERRY. So I return to my first question: If a harmonious policy is to be developed by either party, certainly it must be done through the procedure which has been recognized as the party system for years. Is not that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. If we are to have party harmony, I believe the party must work through the leadership and must establish a policy which will represent the over-all thinking of the party.

Mr. WHERRY. So, those who represent us in foreign policy matters must have access to all the various procedures we use and the various set-ups we have, in order to be properly informed and to know what is the cross section of opinion of the party. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is always true. Any person who lacks a knowledge of all the facts, no matter what his decision may be, can only guess as to whether he is right or wrong in his decision.

Mr. WHERRY. Have we had that kind of policy since the Senator has been a Member of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. I stated earlier today that at times it worked and at times it did not work.

Mr. WHERRY. Generally speaking, have we had that kind of policy?

Mr. FERGUSON. At times I think we have had it, and at times we have not.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would list the times we have had it, because in my opinion we have not had such a policy, for we have not been consulted. We have not been consulted with respect to foreign policy; and we have not been represented by leadership which would fairly represent a cross-section of opinion in the party, in connection with the debating of foreign policy issues. Until we get that, it seems to me we cannot have a harmonious policy, whether it be called a bipartisan policy, a nonpartisan policy, or anything else.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I expected that my remarks would incite some questions, for I made them in the sincere desire to see whether we could accomplish something in connection with this question, and to provide machinery and ground rules, so to speak, for a very sincere bipartisan foreign policy whereby we would be enabled to speak as a unit to the people of the country.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 21 the Assembly of the State of New York concurred in a resolution, previously approved by the New York State senate, which memorialized the United States Congress to enact House bill 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practices Act. This memorial was inserted in the RECORD of February 22 on the motion of the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I should like to point out, for the information of the Members of the Senate and the country at large, that this resolution was approved by the New York Assembly and also by the New York Senate before the House of Representatives had taken up and completely diluted and emasculated House bill 4453. Hence it would be my judgment that this resolution of the New York State legislature did not in any sense apply to the House bill 4453, which was sent to the Senate a week or two ago.

The United States Senate has before it now both the watered-down version of H. R. 4453 and S. 1728, introduced in the last session by the then Senator Howard McGrath, who now is Attorney General of the United States. S. 1728 is practically the same as H. R. 4453 was before the House took its recent

action. S. 1728 was favorably reported by the Senate Labor Committee last session. Hence I did not have an opportunity to vote on it. Had I been a member of the committee at that time, I certainly would have voted for S. 1728. I certainly expect to vote for it, if given the opportunity, at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senate will shortly take up S. 1728. I trust and hope that we shall have a chance to vote on this bill and to correct the regrettable action taken by the House. I certainly shall do everything in my power to see that this happens.

ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL RECEIPTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1950 AND 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation each April submits its own estimates of Federal receipts for the current fiscal year and for the next fiscal year.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, under the direction of the chairman of that committee, has prepared its estimates of Federal receipts for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. As chairman of the committee, I am releasing the statement today.

The staff of the joint committee does not have, of course, all the facilities which are available to the Treasury Department, and it has never undertaken to put its estimates and judgments against Treasury estimates and Treasury judgments. However, the joint committee submits its staff estimates for whatever benefit they may be to the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the report accompanying the estimates is quite interesting, although very brief. The joint committee staff estimates that Federal net budget receipts under present law will be \$36,600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 and \$35,100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. If expenditures are at the levels estimated in the President's January budget, the staff's estimates of receipts will result in deficits of \$6,700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950 and \$7,300,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. This compares with the estimated deficits in the budget message of \$5,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950 and \$5,100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951.

Attached to the statement is a table on which the statement is based and, of course, certain assumptions are made. I think the Senate will find it most interesting. I take this occasion to say that, based upon past experience, the joint committee staff, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, has not missed the mark greatly in its estimates through the war years and the postwar years.

Therefore, I am releasing this statement today, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATE OF FEDERAL RECEIPTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1950 AND 1951

The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates that Fed-

eral net budget receipts under present law will be \$36,600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 and \$35,100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. If expenditures are at the levels estimated in the President's January budget, the staff's estimate of receipts will result in deficits of \$6,700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950 and \$7,300,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. This compares with the estimated deficits in the budget message of \$5,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950 and \$5,100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. These data are shown in table I.

Table II compares the staff estimates of receipts with those appearing in the January budget and shows the actual receipts in the fiscal year 1949. It will be noted that the staff estimates for the fiscal year 1950 are \$1,200,000,000, and those for 1951, \$2,200,000,000 below the estimates contained in the January budget. It is believed that this difference is due primarily to the fact that the staff estimates take account of the disappointing collections, especially from the individual income tax, since January of this year.

The staff in preparing these estimates assumed an average personal income of \$212,000,000,000 in the calendar year 1950 and \$207,000,000,000 in the first 6 months of the calendar year 1951. These figures do not in-

clude the national service life-insurance refunds, since they are not taxable income. However, these refunds are included in the estimates of personal income reported by the Commerce Department. If they are taken into account the average personal income assumed by the staff would be \$215,000,000,000 in the calendar year 1950 and \$208,000,000,000 in the first 6 months of the calendar year 1951. The Director of the Budget reported that the Treasury had used a personal income level of \$212,000,000,000 for the entire 18-month period January 1950 through June 1951, in preparing the revenue estimates contained in the budget message. Apparently the Treasury assumption also does not include the insurance refunds.

The level of business activity assumed by the staff was arrived at after consultation with a number of outstanding economic analysts, both in private industry and in the Government.

The staff estimates do not take into consideration the effects of any changes in Government expenditures from the levels forecast in the January budget. The estimated receipts are based on the tax laws existing on April 12, 1950.

TABLE I.—Receipts, expenditures, and the deficit of the Federal Government: Actual, fiscal year 1949, and estimates for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951

(In billions of dollars)

	Actual 1949	Estimated 1950			Estimated 1951		
		Staff	Budget	Staff estimates compared with budget estimates	Staff	Budget	Staff estimates compared with budget estimates
Receipts.....	38.2	36.6	37.8	-1.2	35.1	37.3	-2.2
Expenditures (budget estimate).....	40.1	43.3	43.3		42.4	42.4	
Deficit.....	1.8	6.7	5.5	+1.2	7.3	5.1	+2.2

TABLE II.—Receipts of the Federal Government: Actual, fiscal year 1949, and estimates for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951

(In billions of dollars)

	Actual 1949	Estimated 1950		Estimated 1951	
		Staff	Budget	Staff	Budget
Direct taxes on individuals.....	18.7	17.8	18.7	17.5	18.9
Direct taxes on corporations.....	11.6	11.0	11.2	9.9	10.5
Excise taxes.....	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.5	7.6
Net employment taxes.....	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8
Customs.....	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4
Miscellaneous receipts.....	2.1	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1
Refunds of receipts: Deduct.....	2.8	12.2	2.2	12.2	2.2
Total.....	38.2	36.6	37.8	35.1	37.3

¹ Budget estimates.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE CRIME—THE SLAUGHTER CASE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, some 2 weeks ago I addressed myself to the resolution, which then had been for some time on the Senate Calendar, dealing with a proposed investigation of crime.

Following the apparent determination yesterday that consideration of the revised resolution would be further deferred, I wish to express my very great concern over that action, particularly in the light of what I think may justly be termed "the slaughter of the innocent." In that connection I do not refer to the slaying of Mr. Binaggio, inasmuch as I think it may be agreed that there is some doubt as to whether he may have been innocent. Rather, I refer to a case

which finally reached its rather dramatic conclusion in the courts yesterday—the case of Mr. Roger C. Slaughter, of Missouri.

I believe the Senate's records should contain some reference to this matter, in connection with other current developments bearing on the question of the wisdom of having the Senate of the United States now examine the crime situation. I have hitherto addressed myself to that subject, and I expect to continue to address myself to it until some adequate provision is made for an exploration of this situation, which ramifies not merely into the question of the crime of which we talk, but, as I pointed out in my former address, to the question of the pressure of the crime groups into more and more legitimate

businesses, where similar racketeering methods are used in order to destroy the future of honest, earnest, able businessmen and businesswomen.

The presentation by the Slaughter case of what suddenly, upon the records, must appear to be a possible perversion of Federal authority and the prosecution of a man who, upon the records, as presented yesterday in court, was not guilty of any offense, and the fact that the threat of prosecution for the past 2 years, which finally developed into a Federal indictment, culminated yesterday in almost a travesty in the Federal court when the case was dismissed promptly after the Government had presented what apparently was the only evidence it had available, I think, require us to look somewhat further into the question of what is behind this situation.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the reports of those proceedings, as published in the New York Times, the Washington Times-Herald, and the Washington Post, of this morning, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish briefly to summarize how this case arose. Mr. Slaughter was a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of its Rules Committee some 4 years ago. At that time, as a member of the all-powerful Rules Committee, he did not "play ball" with the administration. There were numerous episodes in which he declined to vote in accordance with what were the expressed wishes of the administration and, I think it is proper to say, the wishes of the White House and the President.

Following that, the President indicated his extreme displeasure. There were conferences with the then political power in Kansas City, Mr. James M. Pendergast, who was the successor of the so-called Pendergast machine; and it was determined—and the President so announced—that his displeasure with Mr. Slaughter and his performance as a Member of the House led him, the President, to support Mr. Enos Axtel as the Democratic nominee. A rather bitter primary resulted, in which, on the face of the returns, Mr. Axtel was nominated as the Democratic nominee. In the subsequent election he was defeated by a Republican. However, that is beside our present problem.

There developed, following that, grave questions as to the legality of that election. As a result of investigations by newspapers in Kansas City, there were widespread allegations of fraud. Overwhelming evidence was presented. The result was that 76 election officials were indicted for election frauds in that Democratic primary. The ballots were impounded and were placed in the courthouse in Kansas City.

The primary had been held in August 1946. Thereafter, namely, on May 27, 1947, by a curious coincidence, the President was at the time in Kansas City. This is not to imply that the President was associated with the crime to which I shall refer, but the significance of it

was that the crime occurred within a few blocks of where the President was then located. Undoubtedly, under the protection which is accorded to the President, very properly wherever he travels—and certainly it would not be out of order in Kansas City, where 26 crimes are today unexplained—he probably was protected by an overwhelming group of United States Secret Service men; and yet, in the very shadow of that Presidential party, the safe was blown and the ballots were stolen which constituted, apparently, evidence indispensable to the conviction of the 76 officials theretofore indicted for election frauds. Following that an FBI investigation took place.

Forty-five days from now, any possibility of prosecution for those frauds would expire under the statute of limitations. In spite of the powers of the FBI, in spite of the concern, certainly of the President which one would expect over such conditions in what is very near to his native city, the matter has never been cleared up. Meanwhile, there is about to take place another primary as to which, curiously enough, the President, violating his Nation-wide practice, once again has elected to determine, so far as he may, who shall be nominated in the primary. Whether he will be more successful in this essay in giving advice to his constituency, time alone will tell.

But the significance of the situation is that, following all these episodes, Mr. Slaughter has been relentlessly pursued. Whether it is persecution in the use of Federal power must remain for any citizen to determine in the light of all the facts. But Mr. Slaughter was pursued first in Kansas City and then here in Washington. When he took legitimate employment, he was threatened with prosecution under the Lobbying Act.

A rather curious episode then ensued. In September 1948, on the eve of the momentous presidential election, this case was taken before a grand jury. A Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia heard the charges concerning lobbying, and at that time refused to return an indictment. Here again there is a curious coincidence in that, following the presidential election in November 1948, namely, on November 23, 1948, 3 weeks after the election, Mr. Slaughter was indicted by a grand jury in the District of Columbia. Whether there is any significance in the fact that in September he was not indicted, and that on November 23, 1948, he was indicted, must be left again to the conclusion of all honest and intelligent citizens. The facts remain.

Thereafter, in March 1949, Mr. Slaughter, in the exercise of his judicial rights, through his counsel presented arguments on a motion to dismiss the indictment. That brings us to March 1949. The argument was held under advisement for a solid year before there was any decision. I think most attorneys will agree that that was a somewhat unusual length of time for such a motion to be held under advisement, to determine whether the indictment was adequate and should be prosecuted, or whether it should be dismissed. However, in March 1950, it was finally de-

cided by the court that the motion should be overruled, and that the case should proceed to trial. Mr. Slaughter was still trying in March 1950, to obtain a disposition of the case. It finally culminated yesterday.

Although the agents of the Government have not been able to solve all the problems of crime in Kansas City or in other sections, and do not as yet find any reason why the murder of two witnesses before the grand jury in Kansas City is not obstructing the presentation of their case—although one would infer that murdering a man was a rather effective means of preventing his appearance before the grand jury, yet apparently, the Federal Government has not yet been able to determine that it is an obstruction—the Government, through its representatives was able finally, after four long years, to bring Mr. Slaughter to trial.

We thus see the travesty which was presented in the Federal court yesterday, when Judge Holtzoff heard and decided the case, after a very cursory presentation by the Government. It was shown that Mr. Slaughter had been employed under a contract which at all times had been in the possession of the Government, and which clearly and explicitly excluded him from any activity not in accordance with the terms of the statute; that the contract was drawn for the very purpose of providing that he should not do things which could be construed as lobbying, and that his appearance before committees of the House and Senate was not lobbying, but was in the exercise of a legitimate activity as a lawyer. The contract was in the hands of the Government all the time. The Government presented evidence through the Clerk of the House, that Mr. Slaughter was not registered as a lobbyist. That is a very mysterious fact, because it had been a matter of record for four long years. It was finally put in evidence, and the Government rested, whereupon Judge Holtzoff said, "Case dismissed for lack of evidence."

What sort of administration of justice does this present? In the light of the facts, does it not possibly warrant an investigation by a competent committee of the Senate or of the House, or both, to determine whether there is a proper administration of our Federal and local laws? Under the Constitution the Congress has certain responsibilities of that character, since the Constitution guarantees a republican form of government. I am not entirely sure what a republican form of government means, but I hope we shall be able very shortly to carry out the constitutional requirement and assure a republican form of government; in which event I hope that some of the travesties and tragedies of recent days, coupled with the murder of witnesses who were to appear before the grand jury will be eliminated.

Whether or not one agreed with Mr. Binaggio, I think the statement of Mr. Pendergast, as quoted in the press, must be considered rather naive. I hope that perhaps he will clarify it, but the press reported Mr. Pendergast as saying that the Binaggio murder would help to clear

things up in Kansas City, that with Mr. Binaggio out of the way they could have political harmony, the implication being that that was apparently the only way of solving a political problem.

However, I return to what I started with, namely, that here is presented a case which I think might well be termed a "slaughter of the innocents," or rather, an attempted slaughter, because if there was ever a man who was entitled to sympathy, in the light of all the persecution he has undergone from different agencies, it is Roger C. Slaughter, whose only crime was apparently that he refused to accept the dictation of the administration as to how he should cast his vote as a member of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. Meanwhile the possibility of a crime investigation by the Senate has been pending hear since last January, more and more abounding evidence is accumulating as to the imperative necessity of such an investigation, and still the Senate is not even permitted thus far to consider whether it will vote to adopt the original resolution, the substitute resolution, or the alternative proposal, which have been presented.

I do want to urge a program upon the majority leader, who frankly controls the measures which come before the Senate, since he makes it an issue of protocol and procedure that he shall, and I think there is much to be said for that procedure. But he does accept the very overwhelming responsibility of determining, under that procedure, what it is important the Senate should consider first. I hope that in the very near future the majority leader may feel warranted in permitting the Senate to consider whether there should be an investigation of the crime situation, and investigation covering the entire scope of it, and not confined to Kansas City, but not excluding Kansas City, in all its ramifications.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of April 18, 1950]

SLAUGHTER FREED IN LOBBYING TRIAL—UNITED STATES JUDGE HOLDS GOVERNMENT FAILED TO PROVE EX-MISSOURI REPRESENTATIVE BROKE LAW

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—Former Representative Roger C. Slaughter, Kansas City Democrat, who was "purged" from Congress by President Truman in 1946, won quick acquittal today on a Federal charge that he had violated the Federal Lobbying Act.

United States District Judge Alexander Holtzoff, who was appointed to the court by Mr. Truman in 1945, heard the case without a jury, by agreement of the prosecution and defense, and returned the verdict of innocent after a trial lasting only slightly more than an hour.

Representative Slaughter, who had been a member of the controlling House Rules Committee, was marked for defeat by the President in July 1946, on the ground that he had opposed every administration measure.

The President announced that he had asked James M. Fendergast, nephew of the late Tom Fendergast, boss of the Missouri Democratic machine, to support Enos Axtell against Representative Slaughter.

Mr. Axtell's victory in that primary led to charges of vote fraud in behalf of Mr. Axtell in Kansas City which still are echoing in the Capitol. Mr. Axtell subsequently was beaten by Representative Albert L. Reeves, Jr., a

Republican, in the November election. Mr. Reeves was defeated for reelection in 1948.

INDICTED BY FEDERAL JURY

The indictment on which Mr. Slaughter was tried today was based on his activities after he left Congress. On November 23, 1948, a Federal grand jury here returned an indictment charging that the former Representative had violated Federal law by failing to register as a lobbyist.

Mr. Slaughter contended that his work in Washington for the Kansas City, Chicago, and Minneapolis grain exchanges, including representing them before congressional committees, had been as a lawyer and counsel, and not as a lobbyist.

Ironically enough, one of the laws that Mr. Slaughter was credited with changing probably played an important role in Mr. Truman's surprising election to a full term in his own right in 1948.

As counsel for the grain exchanges, Mr. Slaughter argued successfully before the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress for limitations upon the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy or lease grain elevators in which crops could be stored in order to receive Federal loans.

In 1948, with a bumper corn crop, there was insufficient storage space, and, in mid-October, the price of corn broke below the Federal support level. In November, rural districts that had been counted as safely Republican turned Democratic in large numbers with the result that Mr. Truman won unexpected victories in Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois and Ohio, and, with them, the election.

DECIDED ON LEGAL POINT

The issue before Judge Holtzoff today was a narrow legalistic point—whether Mr. Slaughter had acted as a lobbyist or as a lawyer.

The Government presented only two witnesses. One was Raymond J. Barnes, president of the North American Grain Association of New York, who identified Government exhibits showing that the association had paid \$7,500 as a fee and additional sums as expense money to the defendant.

Dillard Rogers, a clerk in the House of Representatives, who receives registrations by lobbyists, testified that Mr. Slaughter had not registered. The defense admitted that this was true.

The defense offered no witnesses, relying entirely upon the argument that former Representative Slaughter had acted as a lawyer and not as a lobbyist in contacting Members of Congress and appearing before committees.

Judge Holtzoff insisted that the Government confine itself to pertinent, and not circumstantial, evidence demonstrating that Mr. Slaughter specifically had tried to influence votes on pending legislation. The judge held that the Government had not proved its case.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 18, 1950]

JUDGE HOLTZOFF FREES SLAUGHTER IN LOBBYING CASE

(By Frank Holeman)

Former Representative Slaughter, Democrat, of Missouri, victim of President Truman's 1946 purge, yesterday was acquitted by Judge Holtzoff on charges of illegal lobbying in a trial that lasted but a few hours.

Slaughter promptly claimed a smashing victory over Mr. Truman, and hailed the quick verdict as proof that the indictment was nothing but a spite action, growing out of bitter Kansas City politics.

A POLITICAL FIGHT

"At the time of the indictment I said that the charges were false, fraudulent, and politically inspired," Slaughter recalled. "Today's events are one more chapter in a po-

litical fight," he went on. The verdict demonstrated "the Government never had a case, all of which the Government knew or could have known had it been interested in the truth or falsity of their charges."

Holtzoff ruled that the ex-Representative, who was purged by the President in the 1946 primaries, did not do anything in Washington for his clients which would have required him to register under the Federal Lobbying Act.

Special Prosecutor Frank H. Patton, carrying the ball for the Justice Department, had charged that Slaughter was trying to influence votes for several grain exchanges, without registering as a congressional lobbyist.

WAIVES JURY TRIAL

Slaughter waived a jury, and the trial only lasted a few hours. Holtzoff rendered his finding of not guilty immediately.

In one instance, Patton charged, Slaughter used his privileges as a former Member of the House to appear on the floor during debate in which his clients were interested, and talk to Congressmen. Holtzoff said that wasn't proof that Slaughter was actually trying to influence votes.

In another case, the prosecutor declared, Slaughter made several telephone calls and charged them to a client. The judge said that should be ignored unless the Government could show something pertinent in the content of the conversations.

ACTS ONLY AS COUNSEL

Defense Attorney William E. Leahy admitted that Slaughter was a Washington representative for the Kansas City and Chicago Boards of Trade, the Minneapolis Grain Exchange, and the American Grain Export Association of New York. But his contracts specifically provided that he would act only as counsel and not make any personal contacts with Congressmen, Leahy said.

Holtzoff ruled that no evidence had been introduced to prove that Slaughter did anything for his clients except appear before congressional committees, or prepare statements for others. The Lobby Act does not require registration by a person who only does that.

[From the Washington Post of April 18, 1950]

ROGER SLAUGHTER, FOE OF TRUMAN, CLEARED OF LOBBYING CHARGES—SAYS HE HAD ACTED ONLY AS ATTORNEY—NO WITNESSES CALLED BY THE DEFENSE

In less than 2 hours yesterday District Judge Alexander Holtzoff cleared former Missouri Congressman Roger C. Slaughter of charges that he violated the Lobbying Act.

Slaughter waived a jury trial in district court here. The Government presented only two witnesses, Slaughter none.

The former House Member was indicted in 1948. The Government charged that he got \$25,000 salary and \$18,599.13 expenses for trying to influence legislation in the Eightieth Congress in behalf of the Chicago and Kansas City Boards of Trade and the Minneapolis Grain Exchange; and \$7,500 salary and \$2,258.41 expenses from the North American Export Grain Association, of New York, for similar work.

Slaughter maintained that his services were those of an attorney, and did not include lobbying. His counsel conceded he had not registered as a lobbyist.

William E. Leahy, Slaughter's counsel, said that his client operated only as an attorney in helping grain exchange witnesses present their testimony to congressional committees.

Holtzoff held that a person is not required to register as a lobbyist for appearing before a committee or gathering material and helping prepare statements for witnesses who testify before such committees.

Slaughter, a Democrat, served in Congress from a Kansas City district. President Truman set out to "purge" him in 1946. Enos

Axtell, the candidate Mr. Truman endorsed, defeated Slaughter in the primary, but Axtell in turn lost to a Republican.

Slaughter, who maintains law offices in Kansas City, commented after the judge's decision that "today's events are one more chapter in a political fight." He said he was happy to be able to demonstrate that "the Government never had a case."

Judge Holtzoff asked Government attorneys at the end of their opening argument whether they intended to show Slaughter performed any acts of lobbying by contacting Congressmen outside of committees.

Frank H. Patton, Assistant Attorney General, replied that the Government proposed to prove that Slaughter made long-distance calls to Congressmen and sent the bills to his clients. In reply to a question from the judge he said he did not know what was said during the calls.

Judge Holtzoff then indicated he would not permit the testimony unless there was proof of the nature of the conversation.

Similarly Patton said the Government expected to show Slaughter was on the House floor—a privilege given former Congressmen—when one of the bills in which he was interested was being considered. But he said he did not know what Slaughter might have said to the Congressmen.

[In one case Slaughter was accused of seeking defeat of the International Wheat Agreement.]

[The International Wheat Agreement sets sale terms for about half the wheat moved in world trade. It went into effect August 1, 1949, and embraced 41 big wheat-producing and importing nations, including the United States.—Editor's note.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is amazing what one hears in a political year.

Mr. BREWSTER. And also what one does.

Mr. LUCAS. I know very little about the Slaughter case. I assume that those responsible for the indictment of Mr. Slaughter were members of a Federal grand jury, who heard all the evidence presented, and who at least believed there was a case against him. The court held yesterday there was not a case, and dismissed it.

I presume if one wanted to look into the records of the Federal courts it would be possible to discover every year a case in which an indictment had been returned, which the court had dismissed for lack of evidence. It certainly is not an unusual situation, either in the Federal courts or in the State courts.

Insofar as the resolution is concerned, which is the subject of the present discussion, and which seeks to investigate the interstate crime situation, I think I have made myself clear, to those who desire clarity, that the Senator from Illinois will desire in no way to thwart the efforts of the investigating committee, which will be appointed ultimately, to go fully into the question of interstate criminal activities.

As I said yesterday, members of such committee may go as far as they desire; they may look into any crime interstate in character they desire to investigate; they may go into any State they desire, or to any place, so far as I am concerned. I have no hesitancy in saying that certainly I shall have no disposition to thwart the efforts of the committee.

However, I am sure the Senator from Maine, who, most of the time, has gone

along with the foreign policy of the United States, would not say to the Senate or to the country that the consideration of this resolution, which we know would require at least 2 days for debate, is more important to the Senate and to the country than is the consideration of the European recovery program, which the Senate took up last night. The Senate, by a voice vote, said overwhelmingly—and I think the votes came from both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle—that the ECA authorization bill which is now pending before the Senate was far more important than consideration of a resolution dealing with the existence of crime syndicates throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say. I repeat what I said in the beginning: This is a political year, a year in which Senators are to be reelected, and we may expect to hear the Senator from Maine and other Senators denouncing and criticizing the administration from practically every conceivable angle. We expect that, Mr. President, in an election year. If the time were a year ago the Senator probably would not have taken the floor and defended Mr. Slaughter in such glowing and eloquent terms.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John C. McQueen

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose heart always responds to those who truly seek to wor-

ship and serve Thee, may this moment of prayer be one of insight and of inspiration.

We pray that Thy servants may be blessed with a clear vision of the high and helpful things they may do together as they again assemble to take counsel with one another.

Thou knowest how deeply concerned they are about the welfare of our own beloved country and all mankind. Inspire them with those noble impulses and desires which are the progenitors of achievement in building a better world.

May we feel the compelling constraint to labor more earnestly as we look forward to the coming of that glorious day of peace which Thou dost will and sanction.

Hear us, in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 6, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to a special order agreed to on April 5, 1950, the Clerk of the House of Representatives received on April 14, 1950, a message from the Senate announcing that the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 190. A concurrent resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS ON THE PATRIOTS' DAY CELEBRATION COMMISSION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Concurrent Resolution 190, Eighty-first Congress, and the order of the House of April 5, 1950, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on April 14, 1950, appoint as Commissioners on the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. GOODWIN.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5472. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 17, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on April 5, 1950, the Clerk received on the following dates, from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

On April 11, 1950:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2246) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2734) entitled "An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2559) entitled "An act to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action"; and

That the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 125. A concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 5,000 copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Study of Monopoly Power"; and

H. Con. Res. 192. A concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of hearings relative to revenue revision held before the Committee on Ways and Means during the current session, including an index; and

On April 12, 1950:

That the Senate had passed without amendment the bill H. R. 6656, for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini; and

On April 13, 1950:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2911) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense

Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites"; and

That the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 190, to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; and

That the Senate had passed with amendments the concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 184. A concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Brigham Young; and

H. Con. Res. 186. A concurrent resolution authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on April 5, 1950, he signed enrolled bills as follows:

On April 12, 1950:

S. 2246. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2559. An act to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action; and

S. 2734. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

On April 14, 1950:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

PATRIOTS' DAY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Concurrent Resolution 190, Eighty-first Congress, and the order of the House of April 5, 1950, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on April 14, 1950, appoint as commissioners on the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. GOODWIN.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 18, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the President of the

United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, received in the office of the Clerk on April 15, 1950.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

NATURAL GAS ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 555)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1758, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

This bill would preclude the Federal Power Commission from regulating sales of natural gas to interstate pipe-line companies; for resale in interstate commerce, by producers and gatherers who are not affiliated with the buyers. After careful analysis and full consideration, I believe that such an action would not be in the national interest.

I believe that authority to regulate such sales is necessary in the public interest because of the inherent characteristics of the process of moving gas from the field to the consumer. Unlike purchasers of coal and oil, purchasers of natural gas cannot easily move from one producer to another in search of lower prices. Natural gas is transported to consumers by pipe lines, and is distributed in a given consuming market by a single company. The pipe-line companies, and in turn the consumers of natural gas, are bound to the producers and gatherers in a given field by the physical location of their pipe lines, which represent large investments of funds, and cannot readily be moved to other fields in search of a better price.

These characteristics of the natural-gas business impose natural limitations upon effective competition among sellers. Competition is further limited by the degree of concentration of ownership of natural-gas reserves. While there are a large number of producers and gatherers, a relatively small number of them own a substantial majority of the gas reserves. Furthermore, the demand for natural gas has been growing phenomenally in recent years, and its natural advantages as a fuel, coupled with its present price advantage, indicate that demand may soon be pressing hard upon total supplies.

Under these circumstances, there is a clear possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels. Accordingly, to remove the authority to regulate, as this bill would do, does not seem to me to be wise public policy.

It is argued that regulation of sales of natural gas to pipe-line companies would discourage producers and gatherers from selling their gas in interstate commerce, and would discourage exploration and development of new wells. This claim rests primarily on the assumption that the Federal Power Commission would apply standards of regulation which did not take account of the peculiar circumstances of natural-gas production—such as the cost of exploration and develop-

ment, including the drilling of dry holes. I do not believe this assumption is well-founded. On the contrary, I am confident that the Commission will apply standards properly suited to the special risks and circumstances of independent natural-gas producers and gatherers.

My confidence in this outcome is supported by the fact that, until recently, the Commission has not found it necessary to undertake to regulate the prices charged by independent gas producers and gatherers, although those prices have been advancing. It is only natural that prices have risen, since the interstate lines built during and since the war have offered a far wider market than existed previously and have resulted in more competition among buyers. This process of price adjustment will probably continue, and it is right that it should if held within reasonable limits.

Accordingly, producers and gatherers are finding, and I am sure will continue to find, strong incentives to search out new sources of natural gas and to sell their gas in interstate commerce. I believe the production and sale of natural gas will continue to grow rapidly, to the benefit of consumers and of all the businessmen concerned with serving them. I see no danger to that growth in the continuance of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate sales of gas to interstate pipe lines.

The continuance of that authority will adequately protect the public interest by permitting the Commission to prevent unreasonable and excessive prices, which would give large windfall profits to gas producers, at the expense of consumers, with no benefit to the Nation in terms of additional exploration and production. Such cases are few, if any, at the present time, but the authority to deal with them in the future clearly should not be dissipated.

Experience may demonstrate that some improvement of the existing statute may be desirable. I have no doubt that the Commission will operate reasonably and in the public interest in carrying out the present law, but I would have no objection to reasonable amendments if they are found to be needed.

To withdraw entirely from this field of regulation, however, impelled only by imaginary fears, and in the face of a record of accomplishment under the present law which is successful from the standpoint of consumer, distributor, carrier, and producer alike, would not be in the public interest. Accordingly, I am compelled to return this bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 15, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed.

A REGRETTABLE VETO

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include at this point the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 16, 1950:

A REGRETTABLE VETO

Mistakenly, we strongly believe, from the standpoint of the interests of the gas industry and gas consumers, President Truman has vetoed the Kerr amendment to the 1938 Natural Gas Act. In view of the favorable attitude he is understood to have held toward the measure in the amended form it was passed by both Houses of Congress, Mr. Truman's surprising veto can be attributed only to the intense and powerful pressure that has been built up against the bill. We think it safe to predict that many of those who have helped to bring this pressure to bear will live to see that they were acting against their own interests.

A large part of the tremendous pressure for veto of the bill has come from misguided representatives of the consuming public who have an erroneous understanding of the measure and its effect. This misunderstanding has produced widespread (although baseless) fear in natural-gas consuming States that if the bill became law it would mean an increase in the price they pay for gas. It is a misrepresentation which has been deliberately fostered by some and innocently accepted by many. Opponents of the measure have represented it falsely as "removing" gas producers from Federal control, as "killing" Federal regulation of the price charged for gas by producers, and as thus paving the way for a gigantic "grab."

BILL ONLY DEFINED INTENT OF LAW

The measure, of course, does nothing of the kind. It does not remove Federal control of natural-gas prices at the well, for no such control ever existed. Nor, until recently, has the power of the Federal Government to exercise that control ever been claimed. The Kerr bill was intended merely to make clear the intent of Congress that the Government should have no such authority. It would have preserved the policy that has been in force for the last 12 years, and under which a marked decline in the cost of gas to the consumer has occurred.

Defeat of the measure—and it seems unlikely that Congress will be able to override the President's veto—may well bring about just what opponents were seeking to forestall. Instead of holding down the price of gas, it may mean less gas at a higher price.

For the independent producers of gas—those who have no connection with interstate pipe lines—now are left in fear that they will be brought under the price-fixing controls of the Federal Power Commission. Already, under the ambiguous language of a Supreme Court decision, moves have been made in that direction. The FPC has indicated that in such case its policy would be to permit independent producers a return of only 6 percent on their investment in producing wells, with no allowance to offset even the cost of drilling wells which fail to produce.

Gas wells often are brought in incidental to the drilling of an oil well. In such instances, producers might elect to shut in the well rather than subject themselves to FPC regulation, realizing that from the control of gas it would be only a short step to the control of oil, and thence to nationalization of the entire energy-producing industry—coal and water power as well as gas and oil. Thus might be started a chain of price fixing by Government edict would mean the death of the whole principle of free enterprise upon which the economy of this country has been built.

The certain result of the regulation foreshadowed by the Kerr bill veto will be the production of less gas. Texas Railroad Commissioner Ernest Thompson has reported that 3,504 completed gas wells in the State already are shut in because of the fear of their owners that selling gas in interstate commerce will bring them under utility regulation. The owners of these wells cannot

be blamed if they keep them out of production. More gas may be withdrawn from interstate commerce, in this and other producing States. Unwillingness to subject themselves to rigid Federal controls will have the effect of discouraging many producers from drilling new gas wells.

WOULD MEAN GAS SUPPLY CURTAILMENT

This not only would mean less gas for areas in consuming States now receiving this fuel, but a halt to the extension of pipe lines to supply areas which want but do not have natural gas. It is pertinent to mention that the lessening of gas supply and the halt in extension of gas service to new areas would follow closely another boost in the price of coal due to the recent \$105,000,000 annual increase in wages won by the mine workers. The fact that coal prices have been steadily on the increase, while gas prices have been declining, no doubt is the reason for some of the powerful opposition to the Kerr gas bill.

While the coal industry may be protected, plainly the coal consumer is not going to be benefited by being cut off from an alternate type of fuel whose price is not at the mercy of Czar John L. Lewis' whim. Neither are those consumers who, now using gas, may be thrown back by curtailed supply upon dependence on coal for heating their homes and operating their industries.

CONTRACTS WOULD BE MEANINGLESS

That the apprehension of producers over lost freedom of action is real is evidenced by the views of some power commissioners that, under Federal control, wells delivering gas to an interstate pipe line would have to continue to do so, regardless of contract expiration. This not only would rob producers of freedom to sell their product in a competitive market but it would make them extremely reluctant to contract for interstate sale of gas. At first blush such a requirement might seem to protect consumers against shrinkage in the gas supply. But gas wells give out, and connections with new ones would be necessary to maintain supply. Producers might be far more inclined to sell their gas at home for what it would bring in a competitive market, rather than deliver it at a rigidly controlled price into interstate commerce.

Texas, as a principal gas producing State, stands to lose heavily by veto of the Kerr bill. Nobody, except a few interests which have shown scant regard in the past for the public welfare, stands to gain by it. We believe the national interest and national defense have not been served, but have been seriously damaged, by the veto action.

WHOLESALE TARIFF CUTTING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I note in the newspapers that we are going to be requested to allow the State Department to monkey with the tariff again, and that they have some 2,500 items on which they wish to reduce the tariff. Let me say to the Members of Congress and to the American people who want to work, and to American industry which wants to operate, that if you are going to permit these tariffs to be cut by the State Department, a body that has no right to monkey with the tariff, you are going to have a lot of unemployment in this country and a lot of mills and factories closed down, with our people walking around

looking for jobs. But there will be no jobs; the foreign countries are going to import all the things necessary to take care of the American people. If that is the way the State Department expects to handle the situation, it is wrong. I beg of the Congress to diligently watch the reciprocal trade agreements. It is time, high time, for us to stop looking after other people, all over the world. Let us keep in mind it is our duty to look after the American people. The New Deal and the Fair Deal will be a raw deal for America.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate for passing Concurrent Resolution 190, which commemorates the celebration of the Battles of Lexington and Concord. Tomorrow is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of these battles and it forcefully commands our attention again to the notable fact that freedom is the most valuable asset of mankind and that once gained and experienced death is preferable to its loss. This was the spirit in the heart of every patriot of Concord and Lexington and the nearby villages and towns on the morning of the 19th of April 1775. Forever since then this spirit has been alive and burning in the mortal heart of every patriotic American. As darkness merged into dawn of that momentous Wednesday the fate and destiny of a great nation smoldered within their rugged breasts. Nobly and courageously they dared to be free and their valor breathed life into the Nation which has twice saved the world from oppression and slavery and which stands at this threatening moment as the champion of freedom. In rightful tribute forever and always never have so many owed so much to so few. In this fateful hour our solemn duty orders us to hold fast to all they gained and to measure every act and deed for we cannot fail to successfully meet the test of our times. This spot of earth on which freedom was born is immortal and I am proud, so deeply proud to represent it in the Congress of the United States.

THE NEED FOR REMOVING EXCISE TAXES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting my constituents, as have most of the Members of this House. I was very much impressed with the worry that is in the minds of most of the people in the great State of New York. First of all, the people are harassed by taxes. They can-

not understand why this, the Eighty-first Congress, has done nothing about removing the excise taxes that are plaguing the people. They are putting this responsibility squarely at our door. It is a very hard question to answer.

There is literally a buyers' strike in New York State; department stores are very empty; their sales are down. I see by the newspapers this morning that last month's sales were off from 7 to 10 percent. Unemployment is on the increase and, besides that, people are disturbed by rumors that all is not well in Washington in Government departments, notably in the Department of State. They are saying, "What is the Congress doing?" It is waxing late; we must act now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

CONTINUANCE ON PAY ROLL OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 454.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners," approved August 21, 1935, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the third paragraph under the heading 'Clerical assistance to Senators' of section 1 of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 2, sec. 92a), in case of the death or resignation of a Member of the House during his term of office, the clerical assistants designated by him and borne upon the clerk-hire pay rolls of the House of Representatives on the date of such death or resignation shall be continued upon such pay rolls at their respective salaries until the successor to such Member of the House is elected to fill the vacancy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how does that differ from the present law?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this differs from the present law to the extent that there is a 6-month limitation in the present law, and this will permit clerical employees designated by a Member who may have resigned or who may have been removed by death to remain on until a successor is chosen.

I may say to the gentleman that this resolution comes up at this time because of a particular situation existing in the case of our late colleague from Illinois, Mr. Gorski. No special election is to be held to fill his place and that constituency will be without a contact in Washington until after the next election. That is the purpose of the present resolution.

Mr. RICH. It keeps the office force intact for the handling of the affairs of that district until an election is held?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct, and I understand that it will apply also in the

case of our late colleague, Mr. Church, of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am having more of my usual trouble about being confused and uncertain as to just what to do.

Last week when the Kerr bill was up for consideration I listened very carefully, very attentively, to the eloquent speech made by our distinguished Speaker. I would have been almost persuaded to vote the way he recommended had I not already been persuaded to vote that way because of what I thought and the bill was a meritorious bill.

However, it would be extremely helpful to Members on the minority side—at least I know it would be to me—if in the future, before urging us to vote for any particular piece of legislation, our distinguished Speaker would learn whether or not if we voted as he recommended and the bill was passed by the Congress, it will be vetoed or signed by the President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a copy of the veto message of the President in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The veto message has already been printed in the RECORD as it was read in the House.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I was given permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am advised that the cost exceeds the amount allowed in the sum of \$225.50. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill H. R. 1758, and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. Rockwell, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$270.34.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include in each case extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short quotation from Professor Monk, of the University of North Dakota, on peace.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. John B. Trevor.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, Mr. Truman Takes the Credit.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, How Your Tax Bill Grew.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a general letter he wrote to his constituents.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain statistical material.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by William H. McIntyre, national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by William Henry Chamberlin which appeared in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters and a newspaper article.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Flag Day raising in American

Samoa and include a statement by Peter Tali Coleman, of American Samoa.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain excerpts and newspaper articles.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the general appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole today all debate be confined to general debate, that general debate on chapter No. 2 close when the Committee rises, and that we take up the bill for amendment, beginning with chapter 1, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we going to have general debate on each chapter later?

Mr. CANNON. Later, as we come to each chapter in sequence, there will be 2 hours of general debate, and the chapter will then be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, are you going to cut that bill down about a billion dollars?

Mr. CANNON. We would like to have the gentleman's assistance in at least holding it to the present figure.

Mr. RICH. I will be here helping to cut it down.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this chapter of the bill deals with appropriations for the House of Representatives, Architect of the Capitol, Botanic Garden, Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office. Following established custom, the committee has excluded from consideration all items set up under the Senate. No amounts are included in the bill for those items. The other body will therefore have to insert its own amounts when the bill is before it.

SUMMARY AMOUNTS

For purposes embraced by this chapter, total appropriations of \$56,822,450 are recommended, a substantial reduction of \$8,473,946 below the budgetary requests. While the committee recom-

mends substantial reductions affecting numerous items throughout the chapter, we have had little choice but to allow some increase above 1950 appropriations. The amounts recommended exceed 1950 appropriations to date by \$3,379,306, and while this involves numerous increases and decreases as explained in more detail in the report, it comes about largely from two items, namely, \$1,244,000 for mandatory Pay Act costs, within-grade salary promotions, and lapse adjustments, and \$3,050,000 increase for liquidation of contractual obligations in connection with modernization of the Capitol power plant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A total of \$21,574,735 is recommended for all items under this heading, a net increase of \$503,260 above 1950. This net increase is attributable to the general pay raise granted legislative employees last fall and to increased salaries and new positions established by specific House resolutions in the past several months.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The Architect of the Capitol is charged with the structural and mechanical care of the various buildings here on the Hill and with maintenance of the surrounding grounds. Total appropriations of \$7,530,900 are recommended. This reflects a \$6,000,000 decrease below requests for the liquidation appropriation for improvements to the power plant, occasioned by the fact that only \$4,000,000 will be needed next year instead of the \$10,000,000 originally estimated. The work has not progressed as rapidly as had originally been anticipated.

For maintenance, repair, and operation of the Capitol building, the Committee recommends \$582,000 which is somewhat below last year and defers or disallows all increases except for a \$6,000 item for urgently needed repairs to a portion of the roof of the dome.

Two hundred and sixteen thousand dollars is recommended for maintaining the Capitol Grounds. The item for reconstruction of the Capitol Plaza and surrounding driveways has been deferred. The committee is not unmindful of the need for this work but felt that it should be postponed until other construction work on the Capitol Building which will involve heavy trucking has been completed.

For maintaining the two House Office Buildings, the budget estimate of \$875,000 is recommended, a net decrease of about \$3,000 below 1950. Eight thousand dollars is allocated for replacement of a revolving door in the old building which at present represents a dangerous and hazardous condition. Another small item of \$8,000 is required and has been allowed to replace some of the obsolete desk lamps in various offices.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For all items under the Library, \$8,551,000 is recommended. This is an increase of \$469,000 above 1950 appropriations and is attributable almost entirely to Pay Act costs, within-grade promotions, and lapse adjustments, to maintain services at the present level. The

Committee has denied most of the requests for additional personnel but has allowed \$64,600 for approximately 27 additional positions all except 5 of which are for the Copyright Office and the catalog card operation. The Copyright Office is an old-established activity and returns a net profit to the general treasury and thus the additional positions for that office will not be a burden on the taxpayers. The catalog card operation is to a large extent self-supporting, the cost of the additional positions allowed for that activity will be recaptured through increased card sales revenue. Three positions costing about \$12,000 have been allowed to enable the Library to continue to compile monthly lists of Russian publications.

To enable the Reference Service to continue rendering services to Members and Committees of Congress, \$790,000 is recommended. This will maintain the present staff which was increased by about 40 employees with a large increase in appropriation granted last year. In view of the fact that a number of additional personnel provided for last year will not actually have been on the pay roll for the entire fiscal year 1950, the effective level of service rendered in 1951 when the staff will be on a full-year basis should exceed that for the current year.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

For all purposes of the Government Printing Office, including the Superintendent of Documents, the committee recommends \$18,699,800. This includes the usual \$7,500,000 reimbursable working capital fund for the Printing Office and also the funds for all congressional printing and binding. We made a reduction of \$250,000 in the Public Printer's estimate of the cost of furnishing printing and binding for Congress, feeling that the estimate might be a little on the high side although it is somewhat of a guess at this point as to just what are the requirements.

In making the report on this chapter, the subcommittee was unanimous in its decisions, and I wish to express my sincere thanks to the minority members as well as to my colleagues on the Democratic side for their whole-hearted co-operation and the thoroughness with which they discharged the task of writing this chapter of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to touch briefly on the main features of this chapter of the bill and if there are any questions which Members may have, we shall do our best to try to answer them.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. REES. I would like to inquire about two or three items which I know are comparatively small, but I notice you have an increase of \$31,095 for the office of the Doorkeeper. That is in addition, is it not, to the ordinary increases which were allowed in the Eightieth Congress and the first session of the Eighty-first Congress? Thirty-one thousand dollars seems to be quite an increase for a comparatively small office in the Capitol.

Mr. McGRATH. As I outlined in the beginning, some increases are mandatory because of the action of the House

in adopting these various resolutions and of the Congress in enacting the pay raise. The pay increase under this item amounted to \$26,974. Of the \$31,095, to which the gentleman refers, by House Resolution, \$4,121 was mandatory on the committee.

Mr. REES. The same employees in the Doorkeeper's office, but you have increased them by \$31,000 in salary?

Mr. McGRATH. The committee did not. The Congress, by the Pay Increase Act, did.

Mr. REES. How much is the appropriation increased in addition to those provided by the Pay Increase Act?

Mr. McGRATH. Four thousand one hundred and twenty-one dollars. There was \$31,095, and of that amount \$26,000 was in accordance with the Pay Act—\$26,974, to be exact. The Pay Act was the act of Congress, not of the committee. Then increases by House resolutions amounted to \$4,121.

Mr. REES. It was suggested by the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the first session of this Congress that insofar as possible they might absorb some of the additional costs of these offices. Was that looked into by this subcommittee? I thought it might be possible there could be some reductions in force in order to take care of these additional costs.

Mr. McGRATH. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas knows that these are statutory positions, created specifically by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has again expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. REES. I would like to make one other inquiry, and that is with respect to the office of the Sergeant at Arms. There is an increase of \$15,000. Is that the same situation? That is to say, the increases were allowed by the Congress?

Mr. McGRATH. The item was \$15,505, and every cent of that is due to the pay raise.

Mr. REES. The same thing is true with respect to these other increases for employees; is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. REES. There are no additional employees?

Mr. McGRATH. You are speaking of what now?

Mr. REES. I am speaking of appropriations for the salaries of officers and employees under the House of Representatives.

Mr. McGRATH. No additional positions under these particular items. The only additional positions I referred to were the 27 in the Library of Congress, 22 of which are for self-sustaining activities and their cost will be returned through additional revenue coming into the Treasury. There are five positions, working on special publications, which are really additional positions.

Mr. REES. The gentleman means that we will recover a part of the funds that are being expended for additional employees' salaries in the Library of Congress under this bill?

Mr. McGRATH. Not only that, but I call attention to the fact that in the

copyright office and in the catalog card index operation they have shown a net profit which was returned to the Treasury.

Mr. REES. As I understand, you have increased the cost of copyrights. A copyright used to cost \$1 and now it costs \$4.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman refers to some amendments to the basic law adopted about 2 years ago.

Mr. REES. Perhaps so. That is the reason you have additional revenue?

Mr. McGRATH. It is one of the contributing reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has again expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, it can be easily seen at the outset that there was not a great deal of operating, as far as costs are concerned, that this committee could do upon this particular chapter of the budget. The greatest item of all, as shown by the hearings and report, is the matter of salaries and mileage for the Members of the House of Representatives. That is just purely mathematical. There are 435 Members, multiply their salaries, plus the mileage each one gets, and that is all there is to it. As long as the House remains the size that it is, the cost of this particular item will remain as it is.

It is somewhat strange at times, though, Mr. Chairman, to sit as a member of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and see some of the items that are charged up against the cost of doing business by the House of Representatives and the Senate. For instance, in this budget is the item for the Botanical Gardens. By the greatest stretch of the imagination one cannot conceive of the Botanical Gardens being necessary to the operation of the House of Representatives or the Senate, yet that is one of the items in this legislative bill. Of course, whenever stories go out as to how much Congress is costing, this is one of the items that is always included in the story, for it is in the legislative budget. It certainly serves a wonderful educational purpose; it is, in effect, a living adjunct to the Library of Congress. But I say again we are charged up with that as part of the expense of doing business in the House and the Senate.

A comparatively small part of the business of the Library of Congress has anything to do with our legislative activities whatsoever. The Library of Congress is the biggest and finest library in all the world. It is truly a national library; it is almost an international library, if you please. Its services are used by people throughout the country, and many requests come to it from many parts of the world, for in the Library we have millions of documents dealing with facts and figures from every nation in the world, facts and figures which, prior to the war, assisted us in many ways and, should another emergency arise, will serve to assist us in the future.

And so it goes. In this budget we have to consider the Government Printing Office. Only a small portion of the Government Printing Office business relates

to the Congress, so that actually, although they come before us and submit their facts and figures as to the volume of business, their method and costs of doing business, which amounts to some \$60,000,000 a year with 7,000 employees. That makes it the biggest printing office in all the world, yet the only thing over which this committee has any control as far as expenditures are concerned is the cost of congressional printing, the cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the cost of legislative calendars, the printing of digests, the printing of reports, the printing of bills and regulations. So there is not a great deal that we were able to do in that respect. There is one item of \$7,500,000, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has pointed out, which is an annual appropriation and amounts to nothing more than providing a sinking fund so that each year the Government Printing Office has this \$7,500,000 to start doing business, buy supplies, pay their help until they get funds from the various departments of the Government for which they do printing. It is returned to the Treasury later.

The House and the Senate could bring about some economies if they would. It may be a little difficult to do so in some instances, but when you stop to figure the cost of printing each page of the RECORD, if there were fewer words spoken, if there were fewer pages printed, of course, the cost of printing the RECORD could be reduced. Each Member of the House could take it upon himself to ration himself, if you want to call it that, upon the number of articles and items that he places in the Appendix of the RECORD, and especially those items which so often so far exceed the authorized limit, in which cases special permission must be had to print the matter notwithstanding the cost. So some economies can be practiced here by each of us which might in a small way reduce some of the expenditures.

I do not recall that the gentleman from New York mentioned the Capitol Police. They have retained the number that they had last year. It will be recalled that a year ago the Sergeant-at-Arms came in and made a request for an additional number of members for the Capitol Police force, which was denied by this committee. I want to say on behalf of Mr. Callahan that when he came to the hearings this year he pointed that fact out and he stated that he now realized our judgment had been better than his and that there had been no real need for the additional number of Capitol Police and that this year for that reason he was asking for no increase in that force.

Another item over which this committee has absolutely no control and unable to do anything about, is the item of telephone service for the Capitol, including the House and Senate. The other body, of course, works a little differently than we do. Along about the 1st of March, after hearings had started and after the estimates had been submitted to us, we found that the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia had granted the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. an increase in rates. That

was not only on the private users of telephones in the District of Columbia and the surrounding territory but it also affected the Congress of the United States. Here again our hands are absolutely tied. As a result of that increase the taxpayers of America will be called upon to pay approximately \$155,000 more for their Capitol telephone service this year than they paid last year. That in itself is another item of increase that must be faced.

Another situation with which the committee is confronted and again it is powerless to do anything about, is that the House of Representatives, through its Committee on House Administration, brings in resolutions providing for another employee or additional employees. Sometimes that committee brings in a resolution providing for an increase in pay for employees of the House, whether it be for the Clerk or any of the rest of them from the Speaker's office on down. The House passes a resolution and there is nothing that this Subcommittee on Appropriations can do except submit to the dictates of the House and allow that pay or that number of employees for your respective services.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, has pointed out while this bill does indicate some decreases, it would be no less than honest and no less than fair if the House were not told that some of these reductions are merely delaying actions, as it were, because all we are doing is putting off until a later date some of the things that must eventually be done on the Capitol Grounds and in the Capitol Building itself. When it is realized that parts of this Capitol are 150 years old, when it is realized other parts which we refer to sometimes as "new" are almost 100 years old, it is immediately appreciated the problem that is now being faced in connection with the maintenance of this structure.

There is an item in here which we hope will complete repairs to the roof of the dome which has been leaking. Of course, that must be stopped. The Architect proposed that we rebuild the west terrace, which is one of those places that is over 100 years old. It must eventually be rebuilt. But as we looked it over and studied the entire situation, it seemed to us that that was one thing that could be delayed without any real serious effect upon the structure itself. But some day in the next 2, 3, or 5 years, that job must be done.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out, there was a pretty large request for repaving the streets of the Capitol and repaving the plaza, restoring some of the sidewalks and renewing some of the drains. Some of those drains have been in here for unaccountable years. They are full of rust, choked with tree roots and fibers, so that the drainage is not as it should be. These streets around the Capitol were built for what used to be called the carriage trade. We all know that a carriage and a team of horses was not a very great load, it did not make much stress on the surface; but in this day and age of large and heavy automobiles, particularly the heavy busses used by the tourist guides here in Washington, that

load is each year becoming heavier and heavier, and eventually some of these streets are going to give way and then, of course, repairs must be made.

In view of the fact that it was deemed necessary in the comparatively near future to rebuild the terrace, in view of the fact we have at least six more months of heavy hauling and heavy use of the streets by the trucks of the contractors that will resume work on the repairs to the House Chamber and the Senate Chamber, it seemed absolutely false economy on our part to now start rebuilding these streets only to have them torn up by these trucks this fall, and by the heavy trucks and machinery which will be necessary when we undertake to rebuild the terraces. It was our opinion that this was not the time to repave and rebuild our streets or rebuild our sidewalks and drainage system. While that did bring about a reduction in the number of dollars to be spent this year for the Capitol Grounds and the Capitol itself, it has not honestly effected a real saving.

Then again, another item, and a sizable one of \$6,000,000, is not a real economy move, and we must be frank about it. As you will recall, a program is under way to transform the lighting system throughout the Capitol, cutting out many of our boilers where we generate our own electricity, cutting out many of the old transformers we have over in the Old House Office Building and the Senate Office Building as well, and eventually bring to the Capitol electricity, power, and heat generated by and purchased from Pepco, finding, as we have through our studies, that that will save a great bit of money and bring about a reduction in the number of employees, plus increased improvement in the service. It was anticipated that the cost for the fiscal year 1951 would be about \$10,000,000, but further checking with the Architect discloses the fact that \$10,000,000 would not be necessary this year. We could not even spend that much this year, so that that figure was reduced to \$4,000,000, effecting a paper saving of \$6,000,000, but that merely means that next year, when this program gets going at a little more rapid gait, we will be faced with the necessity of increasing this appropriation for this particular item at least that much.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out in discussing the Library of Congress, which does call for an item of almost \$9,500,000, they came in to us with a request for quite a few new and additional employees. We looked over all their activities, studied their requests diligently, and we did allow some new employees, as the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out, in what we call the self-sustaining activities. One is an activity calling for the printing, preparing, and issuance and sale of library catalog cards which go to all the libraries throughout the country. These libraries pay for those cards, and the receipts from the sales of those cards go into the General Treasury. Those receipts are adequate to pay for all of the employees in the library which are doing that particular kind of work, having anything to do with it, either in the preparation or

sale or distribution. We felt, inasmuch as the Nation's libraries were spending their money to get this service, that they were entitled to as adequate and speedy a service as the Government could give them. Inasmuch as there is no desire on our part and no purpose, surely, to put the Government in the business of selling library cards for the purpose of making a profit, we did allow them some additional employees so that they could more efficiently and adequately care for the demands being made. The only actual new employees outside of those mentioned were three employees to be allowed solely for use in what is called the Russian section of the Library so that these three employees could continue to compile and interpret and collate and publish monthly lists of Russian papers, magazines, and documents so that they might be available if any occasion is had to refer thereto.

The only other place we added any other employees is another self-sustaining operation; namely, the Copyright Office. As has been mentioned, the rates for copyrights were increased last year. Therefore, we thought it was incumbent on us as a duty to those persons who make use of the Copyright Office to give them efficient, speedy, and effective service, so that there should be no occasion for any great delay in the issuance of these copyrights since these persons are paying higher rates for them now. We did allow a few more employees—not as many as they would like to have had—but a number that we thought would be sufficient to bring into efficient operation the Copyright Office work of filing, accrediting, and selling their services to the American public.

If you will turn in your hearings to page 131, which I assume you all have in your office—at least, they arrived there some time ago—you will find that upon my request Mr. Brockwell, the manager of the House restaurant, gives a full and complete history of the House restaurant, when it started, how it started, why it is necessary, and what the problems are that they face each day; the whole story. Therefore, from now on, in case anyone asks you or makes any comment, as is sometimes done in our daily press, about the operation of this facility, the whole story is here.

We roughly estimated that surely the time of a Member of the House of Representatives ought to be as valuable or worth as much as the time of one of the carpenters who works on the building here, \$2.50 an hour. We figured that if only 300 of the Members use the restaurant each day and it would save them an hour, there is \$750 saved every day of the year that the House is in session. For we must be close to the floor of the House, if we are to properly carry on the Nation's business.

Another thing you Members of the House may have noticed in recent days or weeks is the new experimental traffic lights over across the street between the Capitol and the New and Old House Office Buildings. Traffic is becoming one of the biggest problems we have to solve not only in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation but particularly here on Capitol Hill.

Under the Federal Employees Compensation Act if one of your clerks should be critically injured in crossing a street in this traffic, without proper direction, that one injury to one clerk would cost far more than the cost of installation of these new traffic lights with which we are now experimenting. Therefore, we felt it was a good expenditure of the taxpayers' funds to install one of these lights at one of these corners to see how it works. If it does what the proponents for it say it will do, another light will be installed in the next street. Thus we may be able to have better control of traffic and less hazard to our employees, as well as to Members of the House.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], did mention to you that in our deliberations following the precedent established last year, possibly at my suggestion, we did not look at or listen to any testimony relating to items of expenditure by the other body. We did not touch those items. Not that they are any better than we are, but we felt unless we could hear all of the facts relating to proposed expenditures by the other body, we would not be legislating wisely or properly. Hence, if the other body desires economy and if they want to practice economy in their own expenditures, of course, they, in their wisdom, can work their will on their own requests for appropriations. We are hopeful that they will do as good a job in economizing in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money as we have done for you in the House of Representatives. There is a substantial saving here.

An item of approximately \$180,000 will revert to the Treasury because it was not spent by the House committees, particularly by the Committee on Appropriations. While that in itself may reflect a savings to the taxpayers, my personal opinion is that we could have saved the taxpayers much more than that if the minority on each subcommittee could have a clerk or an employee or an investigator at their own disposal to use any time they saw fit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the committee report as a whole and call your attention to some language which was inserted under the guiding aegis of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I think it might well be considered not only here, but throughout the Nation and particularly in the vicinity of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

The report says this:

Economy neither begins nor ends in the Halls of Congress.

It points out there is a responsibility upon the executive branch of the Government to submit annually to the Congress the estimates of the amount that the Government is going to spend through each one of its agencies. Of course, the President having done that, it comes to us in the form of his budget message. We found not only this year, but in previous years, as the various heads of agencies, bureaus, and departments came to us they had but one thought, namely, that it was their duty to support only the President's budget.

That meant they were bound not to ask for any increase over that which the President told them their agency could have, and by the same token they were bound not to suggest any way or place that cuts could be made.

We tried as best we could, under the new performance budget with the lack of detailed information, to find some place where some economies might possibly be made. But without that necessary detailed information formerly contained in the estimates and without the assistance, on our side, of some detailed searching, it was difficult to find any place where these funds were being expended.

But today, with all of the talk of economy, with our mail filled with letters demanding that Federal expenditures be cut so that there can be an eventual reduction of taxes, so that the load will not be so great upon the 60,000,000 workers in America—because they are the ones who eventually pay the greatest share of the taxes, either directly or indirectly—it does seem possible and probable and proper that the Executive himself should issue to each of his agency and department heads an order, if you please—because they are his appointees; he names them—issue an order directing them to bring about economy in their own departments to whatever extent the President thinks it should be, whether 5 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent, and expect them to accomplish that purpose. If they cannot, now that they have raised the salaries of all these men, in order, so they said, to get better men in the Federal service, let them get out, and let the President put in somebody who will effect some economies. Then perhaps we will start getting some place. But that is the President's responsibility. He could and he should do that very thing.

Yet there is some responsibility that comes right back to the House and Senate—not on the members of the Appropriations Committee particularly, but on the members of the legislative committees—because, no matter what bill it is, any new law costs the taxpayers some additional money. Perhaps it is only a few dollars, but it may run into hundreds of millions. On several occasions during the past few weeks, when members of the subcommittees on appropriations would come from their little cubbyhole hearing rooms where they had been trying to bring about some reduction in Federal expenditures, we came into this Chamber only to find that the legislative committees and this body itself had just approved some legislation that wiped out not only what savings we had been able to make but sometimes costing hundreds of times more. We realized then our work had been completely for naught. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a resolution asking that until this one-package appropriation bill was out of the way, and until the Ways and Means Committee had determined what the new revenue tax bill was going to be, we should call a moratorium on all new legislation or resolutions calling for increased spending, or new spending, until we found out where we were going. Of course, I know

where that resolution is. I cannot tell you the exact pigeonhole, but I can come close to it. Until some action like that is taken, I can see no hope for any great economy, if we continue to pass new laws calling for more spending than we can bring about through cuts by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

That CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 31 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes so that I may answer any questions which may be asked.

Mr. REES. I first want to express my appreciation for the splendid manner in which the gentleman from Kansas has explained this particular portion of the bill. In line with the interrogatories I directed to the gentleman from New York a while ago, I am in favor, of course, of providing all of the assistance and all of the help that is necessary to run our Government. I realize that in this chapter we are talking about only one comparatively small segment of our Government. I would, however, like to inquire whether or not this committee made any exploration or examination with regard to the need of all of the employees now on the Federal pay roll. It has been stated here that funds were recommended for a similar number of employees as last year or, in some cases it recommended one or two additional; but did the gentleman's committee explore or examine into that question at all with respect to need?

I ask that question because last year it was suggested on the floor of the House a number of times that even though salary increases were provided it should be possible to work economies through the employment of a less number of employees. I am just wondering whether this committee had a chance to or did examine into that question?

Mr. SCRIVNER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may state that to my recollection the number of legislative employees, their designation, their duties, and their salaries are fixed by action of this House through recommendation of the Committee on House Administration. When they have spoken our hands are tied.

The remedy, the thing that the gentleman from Kansas is pointing out, a reduction of the number, whether it be in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper's office, or the Speaker's office, wherever it may be, must initiate with the Committee on House Administration. If a reduction is to be made the action has to be accomplished through action taken by the Committee on House Administration. Unless they act, our hands are tied.

Mr. REES. One more question. I have had mail from people complaining about the excessive cost of securing copyrights. That subject matter has been discussed by both the chairman of this subcommittee and the gentlemen from Kansas who now has the floor. The cost of a copyright used to be \$1. All at once

it was increased to \$4. Did this committee examine into the question of whether the increase was justified?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; we did not, because that was not our province. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations has nothing whatsoever to do with any of the charges made by any department or bureau whether it is the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, or the Copyright Office. My recollection is that the fee for a copyright was fixed by statute through action of the House and the Senate. If it is to be revised, there again is the place that the action must be taken. We as a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have no power to go into the cost of copyrights and by our edict fix that charge, any more than we have power arbitrarily to say that the price of the copyright should be reduced.

Mr. REES. The gentleman a few minutes ago suggested that one of the difficulties faced by his subcommittee and the entire Appropriations Committee is that the recommendations made by these departments with respect to the expenditure of funds is never a recommendation of reduction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For nearly 4 years I have asked of nearly every witness: "Is there any place in this item where a reduction can be made, as much as a single dollar?" The answer is always the same: "This is the irreducible minimum."

Mr. REES. The gentleman has spent many hours and days listening to witnesses who come before his committee in respect to these expenditures. Has anyone ever testified that there ought to be reductions in expenditures as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If there was I do not recall it, and I feel that if such recommendation had been made I would have remembered it because it would be such an outstanding event. It would be so outstanding we could not help but remember it. I cannot recall of any single one.

Mr. REES. In other words, it is the gentleman's experience as a member of this great Appropriations Committee of the House that when witnesses come before the committee requesting funds for the various departments of Government, and throughout the whole of the Government, the circumstance is very rare where witnesses recommend that there be reductions in expenses or reductions in the number of employees in any department of the Government?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have heard of none myself, and I know of no other member of the Appropriations Committee making the remark that he heard any such request or suggestion. As a matter of fact, every reduction that has been made has been made over the opposition of the heads of particular departments, bureaus, or agencies, and almost always with the contention on their part that it will cripple the work of their department.

Mr. REES. I make this inquiry in particular for the reason that we are hearing from various sources, including Members of Congress at both ends of the Capitol, that there should be a great reduction in the number of employees of

the Government. So I make the inquiry to find out whether there have been witnesses or anyone come before the committee recommending such reductions, and if so, where such reductions could be made.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume the gentleman is talking about the heads of these various bureaus.

Mr. REES. I am talking about employees of the Government, and especially heads of agencies who testify before this committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We question them and say, "Well, of course, I assume that you know there is a demand for economy in Federal expenditures. I assume that you surely must be for economy in Federal spending." Of course, all of them "are for economy, but." They say, "We cannot make any reduction in spending in my particular department."

Mr. REES. I am simply calling attention to some of the difficulties facing the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Like every other Member of the House, I have enjoyed very much the fine explanation the gentleman has given of this section of the bill. There is a little matter that has been brought to my attention on several occasions. It is not a world-shocking item. For some time down here in the House restaurant, in order to get bread, the staff of life, put on your table, it is necessary to order it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only order it but you must pay for it.

Mr. JENSEN. And pay for it; yes. Everybody is willing to pay for it. However, since every other restaurant puts bread and butter on the table, why is not the same custom followed here in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States? The gentleman comes from a wheat State and I thought possibly he might be interested in knowing why bread, most of which is made from wheat, is not put on the table in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Bread is the staff of life. It should be on the table—charged for, if necessary.

May I recall to the memory of the gentleman from Iowa and other Members of the House that just a couple of weeks ago through the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and Mr. Morris Coover, one of his wheat growers and bakers out in Kinsley, Kans., the Members were given without any extra charge bread containing 16 percent more wheat than present-day bread contains. The report I get, which is unanimous, is that Members of Congress wished that that kind of bread were served in the House and Senate restaurants every day.

Mr. JENSEN. It was wonderful bread. I enjoyed every slice.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, another great farm State, for his commendation.

It might be observed that not only is this bread better, more palatable, but if

all bread were to be made with 16 percent more wheat flour, a great part of the surplus wheat problem would be solved, and our people better fed. The wheat growers and millers of Kansas would be quite happy should this be done. We will do our best to bring that kind of bread in, for I understand a baker here is going to start putting in more flour and less chemicals and compounds. The charge for bread though was just another step showing to the rest of the country at large that we can begin to economize at home. In order to make our deficit a little smaller in the restaurants, we are paying extra for that particular portion of food.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to inquire more about the Federal employees. Can the gentleman tell us what the turn-over is in Federal employees in the course of a year? I have heard statements that some four to five hundred thousand Federal employees quit the Federal service each year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There was nothing brought before this subcommittee regarding that matter, but possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can answer that inquiry for us.

Mr. TABER. The turn-over runs from 30,000 to 50,000 a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would be about 25 percent a year then?

Mr. TABER. Twenty to twenty-five percent, somewhere in there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then to reduce the Federal employees, one might tell some of these departments just to stop hiring them for maybe 4, 5, or 6 months and you could get quite a reduction in some of these departments.

Mr. TABER. Well, you could accomplish a very substantial reduction if they did not fill vacancies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not the turn-over in the Federal Government higher than in private industry, and why is the turn-over so large in the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. Well, it is higher than in private industry, and part of it is due to the fact that there is a very large percentage of young people who go into the service who do not stay there but a little while, and never have, and it is partly due to the fact that they are never satisfied, and they always want to get into something else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wondered whether it was due to the pay or conditions of work.

Mr. TABER. The pay rates are generally higher than they are for comparable work outside.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for these 5 minutes to say a few words

with reference to a problem that I noticed existing in the Southwest. I just came back from home, and I found that the price of eggs there has fallen to the point where it is far below the cost of production. For instance, in the area that I traversed in north Louisiana eggs are selling at retail in large quantities at 25 cents a dozen. I ran across one locality where eggs were selling at retail at 20 cents a dozen. The best eggs, candled and graded, packaged and everything else, are selling around 30 to 35 cents a dozen. I talked to Mrs. Brooks when I got back this morning, and I find she is paying 69 cents a dozen for eggs here in Washington. That impressed me as being entirely out of line. I talked with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan this morning in reference to this problem. The problem seems to be one of merchandising and distribution. It seems that here in the United States we are running a horse-and-buggy distribution system in an atomic age. We cannot get Louisiana eggs, or eggs from the Southwest, which could be bought for from 20 to 25 cents a dozen easily, and deliver them here in Washington for less than 70 cents a dozen, which, to me, does not make sense.

The retailer is selling his eggs for 20 or 25 cents a dozen, which means that the farmer is not getting that amount. He is getting something like 10 or 15 cents a dozen for the eggs down home at the present time.

The matter has been mentioned to me that the cost is in candling the eggs, grading the eggs, crating the eggs, shipping the eggs, handling the eggs, and middlemaning the eggs, and pretty soon the incidental and other costs that arise from the time the eggs leave the farm to the time they reach the home for consumption are almost prohibitive.

It occurs to me that something can and should be done to cut all these intervening costs and give us a streamlined merchandising system in this country. We are not going to get anywhere when we continue on the basis of the farmer's getting nothing for his product and the consumers paying everything to consume the product.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, we are now approaching the end of general debate on the biggest appropriation bill ever considered by the legislative body of any people anywhere in peacetime. It proposes a spending program of over \$41,000,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations advise that the bill represents a saving of one and a third billion dollars over the original budget estimates. It appears that estimated revenue will be between four and five billion dollars less than the amount proposed to be spent.

Furthermore, experience has shown that estimated revenue is likely to fall short rather than overrun. If that is so, then if this bill is passed without further cuts we will be adding between five and six billion dollars to our staggering national debt of nearly two hundred sixty billions.

If the deficit should prove to be \$6,000,000,000 then it will mean that we will be spending every day \$16,000,000 more than we are taking in.

Keeping on running the Government in the red to that extent presents a truly alarming picture and I am satisfied that our people will not be content unless we can come nearer to bringing the budget into balance. We will certainly not be doing our duty in representing our constituents who are demanding substantial cuts in the cost of government unless we effect still greater savings than are contemplated in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

I realize the difficulty of knowing where cuts ought to be made. We all know that there are many duplications and overlappings in the administration of government and we all know that waste and extravagance is ever present. We also know that practically every governmental department and agency is overstaffed. There are many places where an excess of personnel may be reduced without taking away from our people any essential service.

It is unfortunate that we, the legislative body fixing the amount of appropriations, cannot have the cooperation of the executive branch of the Government. Every department head and division head must know full well where savings may be made without any loss of efficiency in the conduct of Government business. Since they will not cooperate to the extent of disclosing their knowledge, then I see no other way than to curtail proportionately and leave it to the various governmental departments and agencies to cut the coat according to the cloth.

My mail contains two classes of letters—one from constituents who ask me when we may ever expect to balance the budget unless we do it now in a period of prosperity and full production. The second class is from constituents who ask me to vote to restore to the appropriation bill some item which has been eliminated by the Committee on Appropriations. Many of these deleted items are undoubtedly desirable, but these constituents must be reminded that such improvements must await a more favorable time when we can better afford it.

I know of no way to economize except to economize. I know of no way to cut expenses except to cut. I feel that the temper of my own people is such that they will not be satisfied with my representation of them in Congress if I preach economy and fail to practice it.

I have never felt that I had to apologize for being one of the so-called economy bloc in Congress and when the votes come on this appropriation bill I propose to be consistent and vote for every reasonable saving which can be made. I know of no other way in which I can demonstrate that I have been sincere when I have warned my people back home that we are headed for national financial disaster unless we can call a halt in reckless Government spending and do it now.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) was given permission to extend his remarks and include two statements, which are estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILES (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness in the family.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), on account of active duty in the Navy.

To Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until April 21, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 14, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter proposing the transfer to the Department of Police, Los Angeles, Calif., two 38-foot picket boats, hull Nos. C-105172 and C-105173, for harbor police protection of the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1373. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1374. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting the third semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 556); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1375. A letter from the national shipwriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of the receipts and expenditures of the Navy Club of the United States of America for the calendar year ending December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1376. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1377. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1943 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1378. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas, and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 13 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1379. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1380. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supple-

mental estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$291,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 557); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$240,000, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 558); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1382. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$49,800 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 559); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1383. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving an increase of \$7,000,000 for the Post Office Department, together with proposed provisions relating to appropriations for that Department for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 560); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1384. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed loan of the bell of the U. S. S. *San Francisco* to the city of San Francisco, Calif., pursuant to provisions of Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1385. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the appointment of Members of the United States Congress in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1386. A letter from the acting chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of claims paid by the United States Atomic Energy Commission during the calendar year 1949, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, section 404; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILES: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6247. A bill authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7984. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 8074. A bill to increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the maximum amount of deposits insurable by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 8075. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating

to reinstatement of war-risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8076. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a) so as to extend the period during which applications for review on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be filed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8077. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8078. A bill to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on Red Lake River, Minn., to include the construction of drainage canals along the western boundary of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8079. A bill to provide for a determination by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as to the feasibility of constructing certain drainage canals along the western boundary of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8080. A bill to permit Chinese students to remain in this country for a period of 3 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8081. A bill to apply unemployment compensation to Federal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8082. A bill to provide for the erection of appropriate memorial stones in certain cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the armed forces in World War II who are missing, missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8083. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 526, 666; 61 Stat. 130), to vest in the Export-Import Bank of Washington the power to guarantee United States investments abroad; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8084. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8085. A bill to provide a minimum rate of pay for employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8086. A bill to decrease the debt limit of the United States from \$275,000,000,000 to \$257,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8087. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8088. A bill to provide for a maximum of funds that may accrue to the Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8089. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 545. Resolution declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to location of the Air Force Academy in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to proposed Federal regulation of size and weight of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to withdrawing the application to Congress made by Assembly Joint Resolution 26 of the 1949 regular session, to propose a constitutional amendment for American participation in a world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to taking whatever action is necessary to prevent the reduction of tariffs on Italian lemons imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to exempting motion pictures and all types of theatrical entertainment from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment-insurance law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8092. A bill for the relief of George W. Colwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8093. A bill for the relief of Regolo Gagliacco and his wife, Gina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8094. A bill for the relief of Yi Fu Chen and his wife, Betty Yi Fu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8095. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 8096. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8097. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Adele Vence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8098. A bill for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 8099. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 8100. A bill for the relief of Sabat Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8101. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 8102. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of L. Shelby Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

2063. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution passed by the General Assembly of Rhode Island, relating to the consolidation of all torpedo activities in order to restore to Newport, R. I., its normal economic life in the centralizing of all manufacture, overhaul, and ranging of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2064. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the Becker County Farm Bureau, of Detroit Lakes, Minn., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2065. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. A. Posthumus and other citizens of Buffalo, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the radio and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2066. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Wellsboro chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2067. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Honolulu, T. H., expressing and conveying their sincere gratitude and deep appreciation for consistent support of the great cause of statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2068. Also, petition of Mrs. B. W. Kellogg and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2069. Also, petition of Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2070. Also, petition of Mrs. Minnie F. Barber and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.